

A
COUNTER-ANTIDOTE,

To purge out the

478. a. 29
Malignant Effects

Of a Late

COUNTERFEIT.

Prepared by

Mr. GYLES SHUTE,

An Unskilful Person in *Polemical Cures*:

BEING

An Answer to his Vindication of his pretended *Antidote*, to prevent the Prevalency of *Anabaptism*.

Shewing that Mr. *Hercules Collins's Reply* to the said Author remains unanswered.

Wherein the *Baptism of Believers* is evinced to be God's Ordinance, and the *Baptized Congregations* proved true Churches of *Jesus Christ*.

With a further Detection of the Error of *Pedo-Baptism*.

To which is added, An Answer to Mr. *Shute's Reply* to Mr. *Collins's Half-sheet*.

BY BENJAMIN KEACH.

L O N D O N:

Printed for H. Bernard, at the Bible in the Poultry. MDCXCIV.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK CITY

1891

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK CITY

1891

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

THE INTRODUCTION.

I Cannot, without Grief and Sorrow of Hearts, reflect upon the sad Consequences of our present Differences in and about the smaller Matters of Religion, whereas we agree in all the Essentials thereof; but do much more resent that bitter and censorious Spirit many shew, and particularly appeareth in the Person I have now to do with, which all that read his Books will quickly perceive. Pray do but see what a kind of Adversifement he put twice into the City Mercury of his last Treatise, &c. wherein he positively denies those he calls Anabaptists to be Churches; and their Baptism he affirms to be a Counterfeit, which is the Baptism of Believers or adult Persons; and that because we do not ground Gospel-baptism upon the Covenant God made with Abraham, but upon the great Commission our blessed Saviour gave to his Disciples after he rose from the Dead, as it is contained, Mat. 28. 19, 20. Mark 16. 15, 16. This is such an Attempt, that none of our Brethren who are Pede-baptists (nor any that ever I read of) assayed to do. Whether our Baptism be a Truth of Christ,

or a Counterfeit, will appear in our Answer; but why are we no Churches? Certainly we are Churches; for a Church may consist of wicked Men as well as of good Men; but I suppose he means we are not true Churches of Christ; he, as I judge, not knowing from what Theam that word is derived, we must be wicked Persons or else Churches of Christ. This Man hath come too near to the Expressions and bitter Reflections John Child uttered against us, falsely called, Anabaptists; who soon after fell under fearful horror of Conscience and Desperation. He wrote a Book against us, rendring us very odious to the World, and casting Contempt upon our faithful Ministers, but quickly was convinced of his horrid Design, crying out, in Despair, That he had touched the Apple of God's Eye; for, said he, if God has any People in the World, those that I have vilified are his, or to that effect. The Lord deliver this Man from such a Spirit and dismal end; but 'tis bad meddling (as we used to say) with edge Tools. Our Saviour shews the danger of rash Judgment; and what have

The Introduction.

we to do to judge our Fellow Servant, much less Churches? We may judge of Things, and freely speak our Minds, according to Light received; but to censure a People after this manner, and only because we differ from him about the Subject and Mode of Baptism, is hard; especially, considering, that we are in all other things of the same Faith with himself, and such that he hath daily Church Communion with; is this lovely or just? is this the Spirit of Jesus Christ? Or doth he appear in the Wisdom that is from above, that is first Pure, then Peaceable, Gentle, easie to be Intreated, full of Mercy and good Fruits, without Partiality and without Hypocrisie, and the Fruits of Righteousness that is sown in Peace of them that make Peace, Jam. 3. 17, 18. What kind of Scoffing, Reproaching, Railing and opprobrious Language he hath cast on us, I shall collect and set down in its proper Place; and yet at the same time he bears very hard upon his Antagonists for using such kind of Terms, &c. p. 4. How will he escape, who says a Man should not Steal, if he Steals? Or, that a Man should not commit Adultery, if he commits Adultery? Rom. 2. 22. Or that says, a Man should not scoff or rail on, and vilifie his Brother when he doth the same thing, and yet pretends he hath not done it; I will not render Railing for Railing, these are his Words; and again saith, I shall labour to declare in the Spirit of Meekness, pag. 4. Hath he been as good as his word, or hath he not? (they are proper Judges who have read his Book.) I think few Men who have had to do with us in this Controversie shewed a more sour Spirit than Mr. Baxter; and yet did he ever

deny us to be Churches, or call our Baptism a Counterfeit? Pray take his Sentiments of us, when in a cool Spirit, these are his words, viz. "That the Anabaptists are godly Men, that differ from us in a Point so difficult that many Papists and Prelatists have maintained that it is not determined in the Scripture, but dependeth upon Tradition of the Church; and I know as good and sober Men of that Mind as of theirs, who are most against them, &c. And again he saith, That Augustin and many Children of Christians were baptized at Age, and that the Controversie is of so great Difficulty, that if in all such Cases none that differ be tolerated, we may not live together in the World or Church, but endlessly excommunicate or persecute one another, Baxter's Book, Principle of Love, page 7. But Mr. Shute hath appeared so bold and rash as if he had an infallible Spirit, and seems to be so lifted up as if he hath done more in his short Treat, than all those learned Men who have formerly and of late times asserted Pedo-baptism.

And that now we are totally confuted, and We, and our Cause of Believers Baptism gone for ever. See his Title Page.

And in pag. 113. saith he, "Thus I have given you one Broad-side more, by which I have brought your whole Opinion by the Lee, and all the Carpenters and Talkers in the Nation cannot save it from Sinking.

I wish he knew his own Spirit and Weakness better, and not thus to admire what he hath done: Doth he think there is none can answer his Arguments? No
saving

saving our Baptism and Churches from sinking to the bottom, which he hath so furiously attacked? sad Case! What could Goliath of Gath, or proud Rabbaketh say more?

But he forgot the old Proverb, Let not him boast that puts on his Armour as he that puts it off.

If I or my Reverend Brother Collins, have in any Writings of Ours used hard Words, we have cause to be troubled, for the Truth never gained any thing that way: 'Tis not hard Words, but hard Arguments that must do the Business; A soft Answer (as Solomon saith) turneth away Wrath.

I must say, I had rather have to do with a Man that hath more Argument and less Confidence than I can find in his Writing, or Spirit.

I am sorry he had no better Counsel, or followed no better Conduct, at such an hour as this is; it sure concerns us all to study the things that make for Peace, and that by which we may edifie one another; the Breach is too wide already. O what want of Love is there in Christians to each other, who are all Members of the Mystical Body of Christ, and Children of one Father, and Heirs of the same glorious Inheritance! Sure we shall love one another when we come to Heaven; and I hope His Reverend Pastor (whom I have more cause both to love and honour than ten thousand Instructors in Christ, he being the blessed Instrument in my Conversion all most forty Years ago) gave no Encouragement to him thus to write and abuse his Brethren. I would he had consider'd the Text, He that hateth his Brother, is in Darkness Joh. 2. 11. For my part I hope I can say I love them in whom I see the Image of God, that differ from

me, in the like degree as those of mine own Opinion. I am persuaded the want of Love to one another is one of the greatest Sins of this Age, and that which is a high Provocation to God; and if that which this Man hath done is a fruit of Love, or tends to promote it, I am mistaken. True, I have (may be) wrote as much of late as another on the Subject of Baptism; but never without Provocation, by means of divers Persons who have of late times wrote against us. I have not begun the Controversie, but have still been on the defensive Side; nor can any justly blame us to clear our selves, and defend that which we believe to be the Truth of Christ when urged to it.

As to his Answer to Mr. Collins, he hath said something, 'tis true, to one or two of his Arguments, but the rest he has passed by in silence, and left the chief Argumentative part, in a great measure, unanswered. And as to his Reply to me, I cannot see he hath said any thing that deserveth my notice at all; but lest the easie, unwary and prejudiced Reader, should conclude he hath done Wonders, should we not return an Answer. I have examined the stress of all that seems Argumentative, which contains but a small part of his Book, and having studied Moderation and Tenderness, I hope it may tend to allay and quench the Fire of his Passion, and bring him to a more moderate Temper.

However, I shall leave it to the Blessing of God to dispose of the Issue of it, as he shall seem good in his all-wise Providence; and to help the Reader, I have divided his Book into Chapters in my Answer; and since he begins with the form or manner of baptizing there, I shall begin also.

C H A P. I.

Wherein it is proved, That Baptism is not Sprinkling nor Pouring of Water on the Face, nor Dipping of the Head only; But that it is Dipping or Plunging of the whole Body under Water.

I shall begin with Mr. Stute's Fifth Page, and shall shew him that he hath not yet buried Mr. Collins his answer, but that it is still alive, and as lively as it was before his pretended Answer came forth.

In pag. 6. he recited what Mr. Collins mentioned in the 2d page of his Reply to his Antidote, viz. where Mr. Collins says, The right mode of Baptism is by Dipping. To which Mr. Stute saith, (in p. 5.) 'I think there is more to be said for Sprinkling or Pouring Water on the Face in Baptism than there is for Dipping or Ducking over Head and Ears in a River or Pond: For the latter is more like a Punishment of Criminals than the Solemnizing of an Ordinance of God; pray hear what the Scripture saith of Sprinkling and of Pouring Water upon Sinners to cleanse them. Heb. 12. 24. And to Jesus, the Mediator of the New Covenant, and to the Blood of Sprinkling, &c. (1 Pet. 1. 2. Elect according to the Foreknowledge of God the Father through Sanctification of the Spirit, unto Obedience and Sprinkling of the Blood of Jesus Christ. And Isa. 44. 3. For I will pour Water upon him that is thirsty, and Floods upon the dry Ground: I will pour my Spirit upon thy Seed, and my Blessings upon thine Offspring. Ez. 36. 25. Then will I sprinkle clean Water upon you, and ye shall be clean from all your Filthiness, and from all your Idols will I cleanse you. Ekd. 2. 8.

'Here you see (say you) we do not read of Dipping, nor Ducking in all those Spiritual Metaphorical Baptisms, which are all nearly related unto the Ordinance of Baptism and tend to the same thing, but more effectually and perfectly, and

'are accompanied with the same Promises, namely, the Remission of Sins, Sanctification by the Spirit, and the Gift of the Holy Ghost; compared with Acts 2. 38, 39.

Answer 1. You might have added many other Places of Scripture, where we read of Sprinkling: But what would it signify? the Sprinkling and Pouring mentioned in these Scriptures, refer not to Water-Baptism: Read your learned Annotators and Expositors, and you will find they agree as one Man, That Sprinkling and Pouring of Water (in Isaiah and Ezekiel, &c.) do refer to the gracious Effusion of the Spirit in the Times of the Gospel, and to the Purifying and Purgings Virtue of the Blood of Christ; and so that in Heb. 12. 24. is to be understood, you should not only say, but prove Baptism to be here intended, and then you had said something.

2. Should the Sprinkling or Pouring in these Scriptures, be meant of Baptism, then it would follow that Baptism has mighty Virtue in it added, even to wash away all Sin and Filthiness: I thought nothing could cleanse from Sin but Christ's precious Blood, as it is applied by the Spirit, through Faith. Baptism, Peter tells you, washes not away the Filthiness of the Flesh, *Not the putting away of the Filthiness of the Flesh, but the answer of a good Conscience towards God, by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, 1 Pet. 3. 20.

3. If you should say, Baptism is chiefly a Sign or lively Symbol of our being sprinkled with the Spirit, or with the Blood of Jesus Christ, we do deny it. You have not attempted to prove it, 'tis evident Baptism is principally a Sign or Symbol of Christ's Death, Burial,

Burial and Resurrection, see Rom. 6. 3, 4. Col. 2. 12, 13. compared with this in 1 Pet. 3. 20, which Sprinkling or Pouring cannot hold forth.

4. But you intimate, That these *Spiritual Metaphorical Baptisms* are nearly related to the Ordinance of Baptism.

I answer, by pouring Floods of Water, or by the great Effusion of the Spirit; I deny not but the Baptism of the Spirit may be held forth; and the Baptism of the Spirit signifies *Immersion*. *Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, &c.* Acts 1. 5. The Greek Word Βαπτίζω, says Casaubon, 'Is to Dip or Plunge, in which Sense, saith he, the Apostles might be said to have been Baptized, for the House in which this was done, was filled with the Holy Ghost, so that the Apostles might seem to have been plunged into it, as in a large fish-pond. See Dr. Duveil on Acts 1. 4, 5.

The learned Casaubon was a Pseudo-baptist, yet knew better than to assert *Baptizo* is to Sprinkle or Pour, but to Dip or Plunge, as you here.

Friend, what do you mean by saying, *All those metaphorical Baptisms are nearly related to the Ordinance of Baptism*; if you intend both signifies Sprinkling, I deny it, for both of them signify Dipping or Overwhelming, and so doth the Baptism of Afflictions also, 'tis not every small degree of Suffering that is the Baptism of Suffering: Great Afflictions are so called, and that from the literal and genuine Signification of the Word *Baptizo*, to dip, to plunge under; and hence (as I have elsewhere shewed) *Vossius* notes, That every light Affliction is not the Baptism of Affliction, but like that of David, Psal. 32. 6. *He drew me out of deep Waters*; hence also Sufferings and Afflictions are called Waves, *Thy Waves and thy Billows are gone over me*, Psal. 42. 7. it refers to Christ's Sufferings, who was overwhelmed with Afflictions, even unto Blood and Death. The same as I have hinted is to be noted as to the Baptism of the Spirit, it signifies the miraculous effusion of the holy Spirit, like that at the Day of Pentecost, Acts 2. 1, 2.

Now, in this respect the Metaphorical Baptisms, are nearly related in Signification with the Ordinance of Baptism: I do confess, for to Baptize in the Name of the Father, &c. is to dip in the Name of the Father, &c. and for a more full and clear Demonstration of this from a multitude of learned Men, both Ancient and Modern. See my late Answer

to Mr. Burke, entitled, *The Reformer reformed*, from page 157. to page 206.

Scapula and *Stephens*, Two famous Men for their great Learning, and accounted Masters of the Greek Tongue, tell us, That *Baptizo* from *Bapto*, as to the first and proper Signification, signifies *Mergo, Immergo, item tingo quod fit Immergendo, insicere, Ambuere, viz. to dip, plunge and overwhelm, put under, cover over, to die in Colours, which is done by Plunging.* *Grotius* saith, it signifies to dip over Head and Ears.

Pastor, an immersion, dipping or submersion, it appears you neither know nor enquire after the proper, literal and genuine Signification of the Word, if you did you would certainly not say, You think there is more to be said for Sprinkling; for I would have you ask such as can tell you, Whether in those Places in the Hebrews, where Sprinkling is mentioned, the Word signifies Baptizing, or whether it is not *vanizing*, another Word and of another Signification.

And as you regard not the literal, so you mind not the mystical Signification of Baptism; which is not chiefly to represent the Sprinkling of Christ's Blood, but to hold forth in a lively Figure his Death, Burial and Resurrection, together with our Death unto Sin, and rising again to walk in newness of Life; as will farther appear in its proper Place. See our late Annotators on *Mark* 3. 6. *And were baptized of him in Jordan.* 'A great part of those who went out to hear John, say they, were baptized, that is, dipped in Jordan.

Tho' they would have the Word to signify washing also, which we deny not; but then say we, 'tis such a Washing as is by Dipping, always, when applyed to this Ordinance.

5. You seem very bold, in saying, 'Dipping over Head and Ears is more like a Punishment of Criminals than the solemnizing of an Ordinance of God.' 'Tis no marvel you reproach us, when you dare cast such contempt upon Christ's Sacred Institution; it is to me a trembling Consideration thus to arraign the Wisdom of God: Nor will it save the matter should you say, You do not think Baptism is Dipping, for it may be so as far as you know; and if you had read what a multitude of learned Men (who were Pseudo-Baptists) do affirm it is Dipping, you would not sure have ventured to assert such a thing: Suppose it be found at the last Day to be Dipping, the Lord give you Repentance, that you may have this

Evil,

Evil, and all others done away through his Blood. Sure there was as much, nay more cause for daring Men to have cast such a Reflection on that legal ordinance of Circumcision.

* But you say Page 6, 7. We do not find that there was either a River, nor Pond of Water in the Taylors House for himself and all his Household to be Dipped or Ducked under Water, for they were all Baptized the same hour of the Night, &c.

1. Answer, Sir, you should take more heed to your words and to what you assert. Is it said they were baptized in the Taylors House? if it could have been done in a House, our Saviour needed not to have gone to the River Jordan to be Baptized; much less into Jordan. Nor was there any reason for Philip and the Eunuch to have gone into the Water.

2. Moreover, doth not the Holy Scripture tell you that John also was Baptizing in *Enon* near *Salim*, because there was much water, John 3: 23. Pray Reader note this well; mind the reason why the Holy Ghost saith, he Baptized in *Enon*; 'tis positively affirmed, because there was much Water in that place, intimating clearly that a little Water will not serve to Baptize Persons in: Also observe what Mr. *Pools Annotations* say on this place of Scripture; thus you will find it expressed, viz. "It is from this apparent, that both Christ and John Baptized by Dipping the Body in Water, else they need not have sought places where had been great plenty of Water. These are his words that wrote those Annotations. And if it be so apparent, 'tis as apparent you have been too bold to say, that Dipping is more like a punishment of Criminals than an ordinance of God.

3. What though we do not read that the *Taylor* had a River, or Pond, in his Yard, or near his House ('tis ridiculous to talk of a River or Pond in his House) yet we ought to believe there was Water enough by, or near his House, to Baptize him and all his, who believed. You see it is granted by your own worthy Brethren, Baptizing is Dipping; there was no need for the Holy Ghost to speak of the place where this Water was, or whether it was a Pond or River: And certainly they did not Baptize some, and sprinkle or rantize others; Gospel-Baptism being but one and the same, as to the subject and mode of Administration.

4. How can you say Page 7. that they were all Baptized in his own House, when the Text speaks not any such thing?

2. How can you presume to assert, that they did not go out of the House? Reader observe the Text well, Acts 16. 30. And brought them out and said, Sirs what must I do to be saved?

Verf. 31. And they said, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, and thy House; and they spake unto him and to all that were in his House, verf. 32.

And he took them the same hour of the Night and washed their Stripes; and was Baptized he and all his, straight way.

Now from these words Mr. *Shute* affirms, that they were all Baptized in his House, that is, in the Taylors House.

2. That they were Baptized the same hour of the Night.

3. That they did not go out of the House to a River. If you can see these three Things in these Verses you have better Eyes than I have.

As to what was done the same hour of the Night 'tis directly in plain words asserted, viz. He washed their Stripes. As to the time when Baptized, it is said, straight way. If you will have the same Hour and Straight way to intend both the washing their Stripes, and their being Baptized, it is more than can be gathered therefrom; but if that be granted, might they not in that hour go a little way out of the House and be Baptized? 'tis evident he abuses the Sacred Text.

4. What reason hath he also to affirm, that none believed but the *Taylor* himself? for so he asserts. These are his words. Page 7. "We do not read of any one Soul of them that did believe besides the *Taylor* himself, before they were Baptized; nor of any one act of Faith they exerted."

1. Answer, We do read in verf. 34. And when he had brought them into his House he set Meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his House.

2. He will say, may be, this was after they were Baptized. I answer, we read not one word of the Taylors believing himself tell then: I mean tho' he believed before, and all his House believed before either were Baptized; yet 'tis not expressed by the Holy Ghost until after they had been Baptized, and were come into his House, and he set Meat before them believing in God with all his House; So that here is as much mention made of that act of Faith his whole House exerted, as of the Taylors own Faith, and as soon also.

3. And is it not evident likewise that they were before out of the Jaylors House, else why is it said *when he had brought them into his House*, &c. that is, after they were Baptized; take heed how you write at another time, lest you provoke God by adding and diminishing from his Sacred Word.

'In Page 12 (you say) you believe, that *there were more modes in Baptism than one, for some went down into the Water, and others were Baptized in their Houses; but (say you) I understand not that any were Ducked all under Water; it is possible their Faces might be Dipped, without Plunging the whole Body under Water, or by pouring Water on their Faces.*

1. Answer, That which you again assert, I again affirm, is not true, viz. That some were Baptized in their Houses; what you have said of the Jaylors being Baptized in his own House, all may see is without Book, and without the least shadow of proof, nor do you, nor can you prove it of any other.

2. If there were more modes of Baptism than one, then there were different significations of the same ordinance, and all of them could not be held forth in the Baptism of each person; for such that were Dipped, tho' it was but the Head only, were taught the proper Mysteries represented thereby, and those that were sprinkled only with Water, or had Water poured upon them, were taught the proper Symbols or signification of that mode; but how absurd that would be I leave to all impartial wise Men to consider.

3. And if this was so, how then was the way and ordinance of God in their Holy administration, one and the same in all the Churches of the Saints? you may as well say the modes of the Administration of the Lords Supper were more than one, and so allow of the *Papish mode* therein, who deny the *Lainy* the Cup. Is this to make the Holy God, a God of order, or of confusion?

4. If Dipping was one mode and Sprinkling another, then would Baptism and Rantism be both ordinances of Christ, ask the learned what the word for (Sprinkling) is in the Greek Tongue, and if they do not tell you (if they speak the truth) 'tis (Rantism) I will confess I have in this done you wrong, and mistook my self: But we deny Sprinkling is Baptism for Dipping of the whole Body; is an essential, not an accident of Baptism. Baptism is compared to a burial, that's clear from *Rom. 6. 3, 4.* as it is confessed by a multitude of learned Men who

were *Pedo Baptists*, as you shall hear anon. Now will you say, if the Face or Head only of a Dead Corps was covered with Earth, and not the whole Body; that the Corps was buried? if you should, would you not be laughed at? Our Saviour was buried, not his Head only, but his whole Body also in the Heart of the Earth, and he whose whole Body is not covered all over in the Earth, is not buried; no more is he whose whole Body is not covered all over in the Water-Baptized. Baptism is a lively Figure of the Burial of our Blessed Lord, and of our Death to Sin and being Buried with him both in Sign and signification.

In Page 12. (say you) produce one positive command or example to prove, that ever any *Woman went down into a River, or Pond to be Dipped, or Ducked, all under water in Baptism, throughout the Book of God, or else take your own man invention to your self; these are your words.*

Answer, If we prove that a Woman by name was Baptized, then we prove a Woman was Dipped, because Baptized in Greek is Dipped in English: and the Dutch (as I have elsewhere shewed) have so Translated the Word, viz. *Dipped or Dipped in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.* Now in *Act. 16.* we read of Lydia who was Baptized, that is, Dipped; and in *Act. 8. 12.* when they believing Philip preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were Baptized, both Men and Women: That is, saith the Dutch Translation, they were Dipped both Men and Women: our Translators have left the Greek word untranslated into our Tongue. What difference is there between *Baptisma* (Greek) and Baptism?

2. But Sir, I cannot but take notice how often you add *Ducking to Dipping*: Is not this to reproach and cast contempt upon us, and on the ordinance of Christ of Dipping believers in his name? The Lord open your Eyes and give you repentance, in mercy to your poor Soul.

'In Page 13. because every Sinner God draws to Christ must come to him naked, &c. So you say *it must be in Baptism, viz. that part of the Man, Woman, or Child that is Baptized must be naked, and so plead only for the Baptizing of the Face.*

1. Answer, Sir, what reason do you give for this? have you any ground to run that parallel from any Text of Scripture? Is it not of your own making and devising? But since you are for plain Texts of Scripture for every thing,

thing, pray where do you read that any Man, or Womans Face, or Head, was only Baptized, or that ever *John Baptists* or *Christs Disciples* Baptized any person naked? You tell us of the immodesty and evil of such a practice, and that it may tend to gratifie the Devil and to the sin of Adultery; certainly such a thing is utterly to be condemned and never was practised, you know well enough, by us whom you reproachfully call *Anabaptists*. As touching what Mr. *Baxter* (to which you might have added Dr. *Feastly*) hath said concerning Baptizing persons naked; we know they as well as you, were too much guilty of backbiting, vilifying, and reproaching of us; yet they had no ground in the least to cast this odium upon us; we challenge all Men or any person living to produce one instance that ever any Man or Woman by any of our persuasion was Baptized naked. As to what Mr. *Tombs* said to Mr. *Baxter*, of a former custom in some nations of Baptizing naked, it affects not us, nor do I believe there was ever any such custom used among any godly Christians. Nor did Mr. *Tombs* ever so Baptize any Maids in *Beyrdeley* nor any where else. If he said he could do it, it was doubtless his weakness so to speak; but I am not bound to believe all that Mr. *Baxter* hath wrote of worthy Mr. *Tombs*; but since they are both dead we will say no more to that; but any thing you can catch up you resolve 'tis plain to make the greatest use of imaginable to reproach your godly Neighbours and the truth of Christ.

In *Pape 15. the Anabaptists* (you say) make a great deal of pudder and stir about the Apostles words in *Romans 6. 3, 4.* and have pressed them into their service; the words are as followeth; there-fore we are buried with him by Baptism; they will (say you) have it that this respects burying in Water over Head and Ears in Baptism, and therefore they make it an argument for Dipping: The Apostle (you say) seems to have been stirring them up, and putting them in mind of their Baptismal vows and Obligations: It may be as well so Children of believing parents that were grown up, as to themselves; for in *vers. 3.* saith he, know ye not that so many of us as were Baptized into Christ, were Baptized into his Death? that is (say you) as they were Baptized into all the privileges, that were purchased by the Death of Christ, so they were baptized also into the sufferings of Christ, for they were obliged by their Baptismal Covenants to take up their Cross and follow the Lord Jesus Christ, &c.

1. Answer, You shall now see whether 'tis only those whom you call *Anabaptists*, that make such improvement of this Text (you say pudder and stir about it) or whether others who were and are *Peto Baptists*, do not make the like use of it, viz. to prove Baptism is an Image, Symbol or representation of Christs Death, and burial and Resurrection, together with our Death unto sin, and vivification to a newness of Life: But before I shall quote the Authors I must tell you the Apostle is not in the context speaking of the sufferings of believers, not a word of bearing the Cross: Therefore from the Scope and coherence of the Text you cannot infer any such conclusion as you do. Pray Reader take notice of the 5th Chapter and the beginning of this 6th, and see if I or this Man speak the truth of the Texts in, *vers. 1.* of this Chapter; the Holy Apostle says thus, *i. e. What shall we say then? Shall we continue in Sin that grace may abound, God forbid; how shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein, vers. 2. Know you not that so many of us as have been Baptized into Jesus Christ, were Baptized into his Death, vers. 3. Therefore we are buried with him by Baptism into Death: That like as Christ was raised up from the Dead by the Glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of Life, vers. 4. For as we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also into the likeness of his Resurrection, vers. 5.* Is here a word of the Cross, or suffering for Christ, or that we are Baptized to shew we must suffer Martyrdom with Christ? no, no, unless it be the Death or mortification of sin or the old Man: Tho' I deny not but such that are Baptized must look for suffering.

You say, our Saviour calls his suffering his Baptism, and a Blood Bloody Baptism it was; but I have a Baptism to be Baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished? now (you say) the Apostle draws his argument from the premises in *verses 4, 5, p. 16.*

Answer, 'Tis very true, the Apostle doth draw his argument from *vers. 4, 5.* &c. but not from *Luk. 12. 50.* the Text you mention about Christs Baptism of suffering, so that 'tis evident to all you have abused this Sacred Text also, and prest it in, to serve your purpose: Pray read all the Annotations you can get on the place particularly, Mr. *Pools*, and see if any favour your exposition of it.

2. Tho' I have said enough to silence this Man or any other upon this Text, *Rom. 6. 3,*

4, 5. in two Treatises, yet left they come not into the Author or Readers Hand, I shall repeat some passages once again.

Let all Men consider in the fear of God, and take notice of the gracious design, and condescension of our blessed Saviour in his instituting of the two great ordinances of the Gospel, viz. the Lords Supper and Baptism; for as that of the Lords Supper doth in a lively Figure represent the breaking of his Body, and the pouring forth of his Blood, so the ordinance of Baptism doth as clearly (if rightly Administered) represent or hold forth the Death, Burial, and resurrection of the same Lord Jesus: Together with our death to sin and rising again to walk in newness of Life; and that this appears from this Text and that in Col. 2. 12. shall, God assisting, be evinced. The whole Church of the Romans, and every member thereof were to reckon themselves dead to Sin, and were bound to live no longer therein, because by Baptism, as in a lively Figure they had held forth the same thing, nay by that Baptismal covenant they were obliged to live and walk in newness of life.

See *Pools Annotations* on the place, where you will find these words, viz. he seems to allude to the manner of Baptizing in those warm Countries, which was to Dip or plunge the party Baptized, and as it were to bury him for a while under water: See the like Phrase, Col. 2. 12. Baptism doth not only represent our Mortification, and death unto sin, but our progress and perseverance therein; Burial implies a continuing under death, so Mortification is a continual dying unto sin: Look as after the Death and Burial of Christ there followed his Resurrection, so it must be with us, we must have Communion with, and conformity to the Lord Jesus Christ, in his Resurrection as well as in his Death; both these are represented and sealed to us, in the Sacrament of Baptism, &c. thus *Pools Annotations*.

The Assembly also in their Annotations on this Text say much the same things, viz. In this Phrase the Apostle seems to allude to the Ancient manner of Baptizing, which was to Dip the party Baptized, and as it were to bury them under Water for a while, and then to raise them up again out of it, to represent the Burial of the old Man and the Resurrection to newness of Life. *Diodate* in his Annotations saith the same. *Cajetan* upon

the place says we are buried with Christ by Baptism into death; by the ceremony of Baptism, because he (that is, the party Baptized) is put under Water, and by this carries a similitude of him that was buried who was put under the Earth. Now because none are buried but dead Men, from this very thing that we are buried in Baptism we are assimilated to Christ buried, and when he was buried.

Tilenus a great Protestant writer in his dispute on this Text Page 88, 89. speaks fully to this case: Baptism, saith he, is the first Sacrament of the New Testament instituted by Christ, in which there is an exact Analogy between the Sign, and the thing signified. The outward Rite in Baptism is threefold.

1. Immersion into the Water
 2. Abiding under the Water
 3. A Resurrection out of the Water.
- The form of Baptism, viz. External and Essential, is no other than the Analogical proportion which the signs keep with the things signified thereby; for the properties of the Water, washing away the defilements of the Body, does in a most suitable similitude set forth the Efficacy of Christ's Blood in blotting out of sin; so dipping into the Water in a most lively similitude sets forth the Mortification of the old Man, and rising out of the Water, the vivification of the new Man — The same plunging into the Water (saith he) holds forth to us that horrible Gulph of Divine Justice, in which Christ for our sakes for a while was in a manner swallowed up; abiding under the Water (how little a time so ever) denotes his descent into Hell, even the very deepest of Lifelessness, which lying in the sealed or guarded Sepulchre, he was accounted as one dead: Rising out of the Water holds forth to us a lively similitude of the conquest which this dead Man got over death; in like manner we being Baptized into his death and buried with him, should rise also with him, and go on in a new Life. Thus far the learned *Tilenus*.

Sir, 'tis time for you to lay to Heart what you have done in trampling upon dipping or Baptizing, that is such a glorious significant ordinance as these Authors tell you, and no doubt speak the mind of God: And in the room of it exalt an humane and an insignificant invention. Doth Rantism or sprinkling

bear any proportion to those great mysteries, here mentioned? doth that figure or hold forth the burial of Christ, or that of the old Man? can a few drops on the Face represent that; or what representation is there in that of a Resurrection? Alas! you know not what you do. But to proceed.

Ambrase saith, Water is that wherein the Body is plunged, to wash away all sin. (I suppose he means 'tis a sign of this,) i. e. that all sin is buried. *Chrysostom* saith, that the old Man is buried and drowned in the Immersion under Water; and when the Baptized person is afterwards raised up out of the Water, it represents the Resurrection of the new Man to newness of Life.

Agnatius Epist. ad Tradi. Philadelph. saith, that believing in his death we may be made partakers of his Resurrection by Baptism. Baptism was given in memory of the death of our Lord.

We perform the Symbols of his death (Mark it Reader) not of the pouring forth of, or sprinkling of his Blood, nor of the Spirit; no, no; but as these Authors say, 'tis a Symbol of his Death, Burial and Resurrection, which sprinkling in no manner of way can represent. *Justin Martyr* saith, we know but one saving Baptism, in regard there is but one Resurrection from the Dead, of which Baptism is an Image.

And from hence we know nothing of your Infants sprinkling. See more in Sir *Norion Knatchbull's* Notes Printed at Oxford 1677. who to the same purpose quotes *Basil the Great, Lactantius, Bernard, &c.*

Mr. Perkins 2. Vol. Cap. 3. on *Gal.* saith, the Dipping of the Body signifies Mortification or fellowship with Christ in his death, the laying under the Water signifies the burial of Sin, and coming out of the Water the Resurrection from Sin to newness of life: And in another place saith, the ancient custom of Baptizing was to Dip all the Body of the Baptized in Water. To these *Ancient Writers* let me once again add here for your further conviction, what some of the chiefest Prelates of the Church of England have very lately said on, *Rom. 6. 3. 4.*

The Reverend Dr. *Sharp* the present Lord Arch-Bishop of York, in a Sermon preached before the Queens Majesty on Easter Day, March 27. 1692. saith he, and this in ancient times was taught every Christian in and by his Baptism; when ever a person was Baptized, he was not only to profess his Faith

in Christ's Death and Resurrection, but he was to look upon himself as obliged in correspondence therewith to mortifie his former carnal affections and to enter upon a new State of Life.

And the very form of Baptism (saith he) did lively represent this obligation to them: For what did their plunging under water signify, but their undertaking, in imitation of Christ's Death and Burial, to forsake all their former evil courses; As their ascending out of the Water did their engagement to lead a Holy and Spiritual Life? This our Apostle (saith he) doth more than once declare to us thus, *Rom. 6. 3. 4. We are buried with Christ by Baptism into Death, that like as Christ was raised up by the glory of the Father, so we should walk in newness of Life.* Thus Dr. *Sharp*.

Dr. *Fowler* (Now Lord Bishop of Gloucester) in his Book of design of Christianity Page 90. on *Rom. 6. 3. 4.* saith, Christians being plunged into the Water, signifies their undertaking and obliging themselves in a Spiritual sense, to die and to be buried with Jesus Christ in an utter renouncing and forsaking all their Sins, that so answering to his resurrection they may live a Holy & godly life.

Also Dr. *Sherlock* (Dean of St. Pauls) in his Sermon, *Charity without usury*, on *Rom. 6. 3. 4.* saith, Our conformity to the Death and Resurrection of our Saviour, consists in dying to Sin and walking in newness of Life: Which saith he, St. Paul tells us is represented by the External ceremony of Baptism, and rising out of his watry Grave a new creature.

Moreover, unto these let me add what Dr. *Tillotson*, the present Lord Arch-Bishop of Canterbury hath wrote: See his Book styled Sermons on several occasions 5th. Edit. Page 188, 189. Speaking also of the same Text, *Rom. 6. 3. 4.* Antiently, saith he, those who were Baptized put off their garments, which signified the putting off the Body of Sin; and were immers'd and buried in the Water, to represent the Death of Sin; and then did rise up again out of the Water, to signify their entrance upon a new Life. And to these customs the Apostle alludes when he says, *How shall we that are dead to Sin live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us that were Baptized into Jesus Christ, were Baptized into his Death, &c.*

Dr Duveil on AB. 8. Page 292, 293. cites a most learned Anonymous French Protestant Writer in his answer to the famous Bishop of Meaux, speaking thus, viz. 'tis most certain, saith he, that Baptism hath not hitherto been Administred, otherwise than by sprinkling, by the most of Protestants. But truly this sprinkling is an abuse, this custom which without any accurate examination, saith he, they retained from the Romish Church, in like manner as many other things, makes their Baptism very defective; it corrupteth its institution and ancient use, and that nearness of similitude which is needful should be betwixt it and Faith, repentance and resurrection. This reflection of Mr. Bossuet deserveth to be seriously considered, to wit, saith he, that this use of plunging hath continued for the space of a whole thousand and three hundred years; hence we may understand that we did not carefully as it was meet, examine things which we have received from the Romish Church.

Calvin also saith 1. 4. c. 16. that Baptism is a form or way of burial; and none but such as are already dead to sin, or have repented from dead works, are to be buried.

But now say we, sprinkling and pouring is not the form of Baptism, because not the form of a Burial; nor can Infants be the subjects of it; because as the learned observe, Baptism is a Symbol of present, not of future regeneration; 'tis an outward sign of that Death unto sin, which the party Baptised passed under then, or ought to have had before Baptis'd; they then professed themselves to be Dead to sin, i. e. when they were Buried with Christ in their Baptism, for the argument of the Apostle lies in that respect, *How shall we that are Dead to sin live any longer therein? know*

you not, that so many of us who were Baptiz'd into Christ were Baptiz'd into his Death, both in sign and signification? And therefore as Dr. Sherlock says, they rise out of that watery Grave as new born Creatures; it denotes not only what they should be hereafter, but what they were actually at that time. So that as this Text and arguments drawn therefrom utterly condemn sprinkling and pouring, as that which is not Christs true Baptism, so it excludes Infants from being the true subjects thereof, because in them appears no such Death to Sin, nor can they be said to come out of that Watery Grave as new born Creatures.

I will only quote one Author more and proceed, and that is learned Zanchy on Col. 2. 12. There are (saith he) two parts in regeneration i. e. Mortification and Vivification, that is called a burial with Christ, this a Resurrection; with Christ; the Sacrament of both these is Baptism; in which we are overwhelmed or buried, and after that do come forth and rise again: It may not be said truly but sacramentally of all that are Baptised, that they are buried with Christ and raised with him, but only of such who have true faith. Thus Zanchy.

Now Sir, see what a stir and pudder (as you call it) these *Pedo-Baptists* make on this Text, Rom. 6. 3, 4. Col. 2. 12. to prove Baptism is Dipping or a figure of a burial? Would you not have us give the true sense of the Word wherein we concur with all learned Men? I hope, by this time Reader, thou art fully satisfied that this Man hath said nothing to weaken our Arguments or Grounds for Dipping, tho' twice as much we have said on this Account, in that Treatise called *The Restor Restiz'd*; but this shall suffice here, as to the Mode of Baptizing.

CHAP. II.

Wherein Mr. Shutes Reply to Mr. Hercules Collins Answer about habitual Faith is considered, detected and clearly refuted; proving that Infants are not required to believe, nor are they (without a miracle) capable so to do, nor are they intended in those places of Scripture that Enjoyns Faith on the Adult.

BEFORE I proceed to take notice of what this Man hath said about Infants having habitual Faith, I shall note two or three things by the Way.

1. 'Tis very remarkable, and worthy the Readers observation, to see how the asserters of *Infant Baptism* differ among themselves about that Faith they suppose to be in Infants,

fants ; for, as I noted in by Answer to Mr. *Smythies Gold refined*, Page 144, some of them, as *Thomas Aquinas* asserts, They have the Faith of the Church, that being intailed upon all who are within the Pale thereof ; others say, they have the Faith of the *Gossips* or *Sureties* ; thus the Church of England, &c. *Musculus* seems to assert ; they have an Imputed Faith ; Mr. *Blake* intimates, They have a Dogmatical Faith only ; Mr. *Baxter* would have it be a saving Faith ; but does not tell us how it agrees or differs from the Faith of the Adult ; some as Mr. *Danvers* observes, say, 'Tis a Physical ; some, a Metaphysical Faith some a hyperphysical Faith ; Some say, They are born Believers, which proceeds from their Parents being in the Covenant and being Believers ; but this is to intail Grace to Nature, and Regeneration to Generation ; nay, and to assert, all are not Children of Wrath by nature, or as they are born and come into the World ; others say, They are made Believers by Baptism, that Ordinance conveying grace, as Mr. *Rossmell*. This Man asserts, they have habitual Faith ; the like do the *Athenian Society* seem to intimate. But which of all these shall we give credit to ? The Truth is, they all speak without Book, having no ground from Gods word to say what they do.

2. We desire it may be considered and carefully heeded, lest we still are abused as Mr. *Collins* hath been, that we stedfastly believe and readily grant it, as an Article of our Faith, That all Infants are under the Guilt and stain of original Sin as they come into the World, and that no Infant can be saved but through the Blood and Imputation of Christs righteousness : And also we do believe, That all those dying Infants who are saved, God doth in some way or another (which is not known to us) *sanctify them* ; for no unclean thing can enter into the Heavenly *Jerusalem*. See our confession of Faith.

3. We do believe, that no dying Infant can be saved that is not in the Covenant of Grace, for 'tis (through or) by the Grace, Mercy and Inconceivable Love of God, as 'tis contained in the Covenant of Grace, that Christ, and all Blessings of Christ, are made over to all the Elect, whether Adult or little Infants. We therefore never asserted, That no Infants of Believers, or of unbelievers either, are in the Covenant of Grace ; but we do assert, all Elect Infants are in it ; Yet we do deny, that the Infants of Believers as such, or as so considered, as being their Natural

Offspring, are in the Covenant of Grace. Having noted these three Things, I shall proceed. First, take what Mr. *Collins* hath asserted in his Answer to Mr. *Shutes* pretended Antidote ; See Page 3. viz. That Infants are saved by Christ we have asserted, because we know of no other Name but Jesus ; but that they are saved by Faith, habitual Faith in Christ, I must confess I never read in all the Book of God ; I could wish he could shew me the Chapter where Christ said any such thing, i.e. that Infants are saved by habitual Faith. And what would this Man make a new Bible, have a new rule, to tell us of things never heard of ? These are Mr. *Collins's* words, Take Mr. *Shutes* reply ; 'pray look into that Chapter, faith be, where you find that God hath declared two ways for saving Elect persons ; one for the saving of dying Infants, without the Grace of Faith ; and the other for saving adult Believers by Faith : And then he asketh two other as impertinent Queries. But he last he fixes upon one Text to prove habitual Faith in Infants, viz. Joh. 3. 9. whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him ; and he cannot sin because he is born of God.

Answer, We say there is but one way to be saved, and that one way is Jesus Christ ; 'tis by his Sacrifice, by his Blood, by his merits, that is, by the imputation of his righteousness ; but that there is the same Way or Mode and no other, for the Application of the Blood and Merits of Christ respecting elect dying Infants ; as there is for the Adult ; and that God doth not, cannot sanctify dying Infants any other way but by infusing the same habit of Faith, which he infuseth into the Adult who believe, he should prove. God is a free Agent, and may have ways to apply the Blood of Christ and Sanctify dying Infants, that we know not of.

2. As to the Text he brings to prove habitual Faith in Infants, of believers, if it be not brought to prove that, that Seed or divine Habit is in infants of believers, as such, it does not concern the present controversy ; 'tis Joh. 3. 9 which we will now consider and examine. And let it be well noted, That the Seed remaineth in him, that sacred habit abides in him, that hath it ; it remains and shall remain in every Soul in whom it is infused : grace in the habit can't be lost, 'Tis a Well or Spring of living Water, that springeth up unto Eternal Life, Joh. 4. 14. Christ hath prayed, That our Faith fail not ; that is, the Seed

or Habit thereof; for the Act, in the exercise of it in part may fail now and then; if the Infants of Believers have the Habit of Faith in them, be sure those Habits will appear, and they must be true Believers and be saved, because the Seed remaineth in them.

3. Why do you not answer Mr. Collins Argument, Page 7. of his reply to you, *saith he, those Children of Believers which die in an unconverted state, either never had the Habits of grace, or else if they had them they have lost them; but there is no losing Habits of grace, ergo they never had them.*

Reader, see what Mr. Shute hath said to this Argument in Page 42. of his last Book, these are his words, *viz. Therefore I will put it to a fair issue, which shall be this, produce me but one place in all my Book where I have asserted this you have charged upon me, and I will turn Anabaptist immediately, &c.*

Answer, If you have not said that the Infants of Believers as such have habitual Faith, what is it you argue for, why do you plead for the habit of Faith to be in them, if you say you plead only for habitual Faith to be in Elect Infants?

1. Then I hope you will only have Elect Infants to be Baptised, and how do you know which they are, since they can make no confession of Faith?

2. Moreover, I also conceive you may allow Baptism to the Infants of Unbelievers: For sure you dare not deny but some of their Seed are comprehended in Gods Eternal Election.

3. The controversy or difference between us and you lies not how dying Elect Infants are Sanctified, &c. whether by the habit of Faith or by some other way, by which God may apply Christs Merits to them, &c. But whether the Infants of Believers as such have the habit of Faith, or Faith in any sense, by which they come to have right to that ordinance, what have we to do with dying Infants? did you Baptise no Infants but such that dye and were sure that all the dying Infants of Believers were elected, it might seem some what to the purpose; tho' not so much neither as you may imagin; for, I do affirm you have as much ground to give them the Lords Supper as you have to Baptise them, because such who are the proper subjects of Baptism, have an immediate right according to the order of the Gospel to the Lords Supper.

You must have a command or Authority

from Christs word to Baptise them, or you ought not to do it; but you have no such command nor Authority.

4. The habit of Faith without the Act gives not a right to that Sacred ordinance, for Faith and a confession of Faith is required: But I must confess I see not how there can be the habit and not the Act; for tho' the habit may be Antecedent to the Act in order of nature, yet not in order of time in any Believer: Prove, if you can, any person that was a Believer, had the habit of Faith, and yet not the Act of Faith at the same time: For as all learned Men generally agree, as soon as life is infused into a dead sinner, there is Hear, Motion, Activity, &c. the habit of grace is a Vital Principle, and as they say, 'tis naturally active, it is a Spring of perpetual motion, as Mr. Charnock shews.

5. You say Infants may believe: And you would have them to be such Children of the *Faylors* Household, who are said to believe, and yet would have it to be only Faith in the habit: But all Men of understanding know believing refers to the Act or exercise of Faith; you may as well say the *Faylor* had no more than the habit of Faith, for read the words again, *viz. be rejoiced believing in God with all his House.*

6. If Infants believe they know the object of their Faith; can any believe in him, whom they know not? Faith all Men (I think) agree has its Seat in the will and understanding, the understanding is illuminated and sees the need, necessity and excellency of Jesus Christ, and so assents that he is the only Saviour as well as the Will consents, bends and bows down in subjection to him: And can any either young or old be said to be Believers or to have Faith, and yet in them is nothing of this? But say you Page 22. *For as much as the Creature is wholly passive in the reception of grace, and Christ is all in all, from the foundation of Mans Salvation to the topstone, therefore a young Child in the Womb or Cradle is as capable of being born again as well as an old one, for both young and old are dead in sin and Trespasses before they are converted.*

Answer, You seem to refer to the Almighty power of God: 'Tis very true, he can if he please infuse grace into a Babe in the Womb or Cradle, nay of Stones raise up Children to Abraham; but the question is not what God can do, but what God doth do: Though we do believe the creature is passive in the first reception

tion of Grace, yet how do you prove God doth regenerate Infants in the Womb or Cradle? Gods Grace is infused into fit and proper subjects; and tho' the Grace by which we believe is from God, yet 'tis the Creature that doth believe. Why do we say that *Irrational creatures* are not fit Soil for the Seed of the world? is it not because they have no understanding? and tho' Infants have rational Souls yet till they come to maturity they have no knowledge nor understanding; the design of God in sowing the Seed or Habit of Grace is, that the Fruits thereof may be produced and brought forth: But you must say the Fruits of grace do not appear in Babes, which is *Love, Joy, Peace, Longsuffering, Gentleness, Goodness, Faith, Meekness, Temperance, &c.* Gal. 5. 22. Nor is it possible it should without a Miracle.

Such as is the Cause, such is the effect or product of it. How God doth Sanctify dying Infants (I speak as to the Mode of it) no mortal Man I am sure can tell; if it is by infusing Grace, let it be so, tho' it can't be proved whilst the World stands, yet Gods design therein could not be the same in them as it is in others; he expecteth no such fruit from them: Nor can any Gospel ordinance be the right of such Infants nor any other, without a precept or example from Gods word.

Baptism (as you have heard) is a significant ordinance, 'tis an outward sign of mortification of sin and of Vivification to a new life, and faith is required in respect of the act of it touching the gracious promise of God made to all such who are the true subjects thereof, see what Dr. Taylor *Late-Bishop of Down* speaks about this notion of Infants having habitual faith, viz. are there any Acts precedent, concomitant or consequent to this pretended habit? this strange invention is absolutely without Art, without Scripture, Reason, or Authority. And further, saith he, if any run for succour to that exploded *Crespugeton*, that Infants have faith or any other inspired habit of I know not what, or how, we desire no more advantage than that they are constrained to answer without Revelation, against reason, common sense and all experience.

Again, he saith, how can any Man know they have faith, since he never saw any sign of it, neither was he told so by any that could tell? Thus Dr. Taylor.

In Page 22. He strangely reflects upon Mr.

Collins; and endeavours to infer that from his Arguments, which no way can in honesty be drawn therefrom, viz. that *the whole strength of his arguments against Infants Baptism naturally tends to the making Adult Believers the Authors of their own Faith and Eternal Salvation.*

Answer, Let all Men consider the nature of this Mans Spirit; what little ground there is for this Conclusion will soon appear to all that read Mr. Collins arguments; doth he deny the infusion of Sacred habits in Believers, or that 'tis not by the grace of God alone, that they are quickened and regenerated, because he knows not that Infants have the like Sacred habits infused into them.

We say the same with worthy Mr. Marshall, in Page 78. of his Book; which you recite in the 24th. Page of yours, viz. that Union between Christ and the Soul is fully accomplished by Christ giving the Spirit of Faith to us, even before we can Ad Faith in the reception of him; because by this grace or Spirit of Faith, the Soul is inclined to an active receiving of Christ. What of this? tho' 'tis thus in the Adult, must this Spirit of Faith or the Habit of Faith be therefore in Infants of Believers also? Sir, let me ask you two or three questions here before I leave this.

Is Regeneration in your Infants that are Regenerated, the fruit or product of that Spirit of Faith or Habits which you plead for, to be infused into them when Infants? sure if they had any such Habits, when Infants, they need no other inspired Habits when they are grown up.

2. I would know since you speak only of those habits to be in Believers Infants, whether they were infused before they were born or after?

3. Seeing some Infants of Infidels or Unbelievers may be elected, nay and it appears to us by Gods working upon the Hearts of such when grown up, (that they were comprehended in his electing love) had not they likewise when Infants habitual Faith and so an equal right to Baptism?

In Page 26 you say, *all the Seed of Believers under the Gospel do partake of all the benefits and privileges of the Covenant of Grace, as much as ever the Seed of professing Jews did under the Law.*

Answer, I say so too; and more: All our Children partake of greater benefits and privileges of the Gospel of the New Covenant than theirs did of it, under the Law, (as to outward

outward dispensation and revelation) when grown up, set under the clear and plain Revelation and Ministration of it: But of what this, 'therefore say you, they have as good, 'a right to the initiating Seal or Token of the Covenant, namely Baptism, as ever the Jews Children had to the initiating Seal of the Covenant, namely Circumcision.

Answer, You go too fast; how do you prove that Baptism is an initiating Seal of the Covenant, some call it an initiating rite into the visible Church, but is it indeed an Ordinance of initiation into the Covenant of Grace; then your Infants are not in the Covenant before Baptized, I know nothing to be the Seal of the Covenant but the Holy Spirit, *Eph. 1. 13, 14.* and *cap. 4. 30.* as touching Circumcision, that was I grant a rite that belonged to the Male Infants of Abraham and his Seed, if it was initiating it, only let them into that National Church, but I doubt not but that the Seed of Abraham according to the Flesh, were all both Males & Females Born Members of that Church.

2. We shall prove by and by, that Circumcision did not appertain unto the Covenant of Grace; read the Arguments in the 1st and 2d. Part of the *An Layd to the Root of the Tree*: And when you write again answer them, for you have not touched one of them; yet Sir you have a great deal of Work cut out all ready for you, before this comes to your Hand. But to proceed, you in page 26. go on to prove what you have asserted, *viz.*

'That it is so (say you) doth clearly appear from our Saviour Christs carriage and deportment towards those little Children, that were brought to him.

'You say those Children were the Children of believers.

Answer, I deny it, so how you are able to prove it, there is no such thing recorded of them, *viz.* That they were the Children of believers: again, page 27. you say Christ did 'bless them with spiritual blessings.

Answer, Friend, may not you be found (as far as you know) to assert false things of Jesus Christ? Is it said he blessed them with spiritual blessings? but since you know so well, pray what spiritual blessings were they? You confess he did not Baptize them; did he then give them habitual Faith for that blessing you plead for to be in Infants? Reader, 'Tis evident Christs way of healing the Sick, was by putting or laying his Hand on such, how do we know but it was the blessing of healing, he prayed

for, and blessed them with? but Mr. Shute tells 'us, God out of the Mouths of Babes and Sucklings hath perfected his praise, page 23.

Answer, Now you have hit it: I do not doubt but those Babes, out of whose Mouths God hath perfected his praise, but that they had more than habitual Faith. Friend, what Babes were they Peter Speaks of? 1 *Pe. 2. 1, 2.* that he calls New-born Babes, out of the Mouths of such Babes, God hath Ordained Strength no doubt.

'You say Christ prayed for none, but for the Elect. page 27.

Answer, Not for spiritual blessings, but how do you know he never prayed for Healing, and other Temporal blessings, for such, that were not of his Elect? you lay down strange and bold assertions. 'You say page 28. *As soon as adult Heathens were converted, and Baptized, if they had Children, they were all Baptized, also with them, as being part of themselves.*

Answer, I deny that likewise; shew what Heathens Children, after the Parents believed and were Baptized their Children also were Baptized.

2. If Children be part of their Parents, then certainly if the Parents go to Heaven all their Children must likewise, for the Whole of believers shall be saved, not a Part of them only. Also if the Children be part of their Parents, and a part of the Person, namely the Face; only is sufficient to be Baptized, then say I the Parents Baptism may serve for the Child: And the truth is, as the Bishop of Down noted, *viz.* Since as some affirm the Parents Faith serves for the Child, why may not the Parents Baptism serve for the Child also? 'You say, That little Children by the Cooperation of the Holy Spirit may have Faith; and the heirs of an Adult Person is no more capable of changing himself than an Infant, and Quote Luther in this case.

Answer, 'Tis true little Children may have Faith if God please to work a Miracle, and Inspire them with his Spirit: But doth God do this to the Infants of Believers? I ask also, Whether the Infants of Infidels be not as capable of this Faith? may I affirm that as many of the Children of Infidels and unbelievers may have the Cooperation of the Spirit in them as the Infants of believers. Disprove it if you can?

23. Doth not God work ordinarily upon such Subjects as have the exercise of Reason, and

understanding : Tho' the grace is given by which we do believe, yet is not the act ours. Can God be said to believe for us, or can there be faith in any subject, and yet no knowledge of the object, no nor one rational act exerted?

But (if this be so, that the Infant believes himself) why do you hint in the Text words, *That a Man is as truly bound to lay hold of the promise for his Children, as for himself* ? There's no need for the Parents to believe for their Children, if they can believe for themselves : Sir pray resolve the doubt, say what faith 'tis Infants have is it their own, do they believe themselves or their Parents for them ?

To put this out of doubt, you in Page 20. go about to prove Infants did believe, and so may believe ; the Text you bring is that in *Mat. 18. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6.* And Jesus called a little Child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, And said, Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little Children, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven. Vers. 6. But who so shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, &c.

Here you make a great stir telling us that Christ speaks of Old Disciples and of Young Disciples, Page 33. Here is the Young Disciple (he) 2 the Old Disciples (them) 3 Christ takes his Observation from the believing Young Disciple, &c.

Answer, I utterly deny that Child, or those little Children, who are positively said to be believe in Christ, to be Infants.

1. For 'tis expressly said, Christ called that Child to him he was able to come, no doubt whom Christ called : Could an Infant do that ?

2. To put the matter out of doubt, 'tis evident as to matter of fact, God hath in our days wrought by his Spirit, savingly on several little Children, some three or four years old, others about six or seven, as Mr. Tenaway in his token for little Children shews and names the Children : Now it might be such a little Child Christ called to him, and who did live in him, and 'tis such little Children he speaks of that do believe in him, who are able to believe ; but what is this to prove Infants do believe and are able to believe. If this be so, you need not plead only for the habit of Faith to be in them, for now you think you have proved they have Faith itself, for believing refers not only to the habit, but to the act also.

3ly. Besides, if we may not conclude they were such little Children, yet (as Mr. Collins observes and divers others) it may intend such believers who have such and such qualities that are in young Children, viz. harmless, humble, innocent, &c. as Paul speaks, in malice be you Children.

From hence you say, 535. that it appears infallibly that little Children of believing Parents are Church Members, and have an indubitable right unto the Ordinance of Baptism, &c.

Answer, I grant those little Children who do believe in Christ, have an indubitable right to Baptism and to the Lords Supper also, as soon as they are Baptised : But not Infants.

In Page 28. You say that Timothy was Baptised when he was a Child.

Answer, I am subject to think he was very young when he did first believe and was Baptised, may be he was a Child ; but prove he was Baptised when he was an Infant and I will become a Pedo Baptist. And since his Mother and Grand-Mother were both believers, no doubt had he been Baptised when an Infant Christ would have left it upon Record, to have put an end to this controversy, which he knew and foresaw in after times would arise.

But this is no whereto be found, so that you are wiser then what is written.

But Sir, are your Infants Church Members with you ; doth the Church you belong unto consists of such as of the Adult ?

I thought none accounted their Infants to be Church Members but those who are for national Churches ; Infant Baptism seem as if it was contrived according to the nature of such a constitution, and not for a Gospel Church constitution, which consisteth only of a Congregation of godly Men and W. men.

In Page 34. You positively affirm, this is the Church of which all the Seed of Believers, are Members as much now as ever the Jews, Children were under the Law. For it is the same Church state, tho' in another dress or under another dispensation. Our Saviour did not destroy the Church state when he excommunicated the unbelieving Jews, &c.

Answer, I thought that the Church you are a Member of was congregational, not national, and I am satisfied that it is so, and that they do own no national Church to be a true Church of Christ, I mean such that consisteth of parents and their Children as under the Law in the national Church of the Jews.

2. I deny that all or any Infants of believers are Members of the Gospel Church; prove it, if you can; and, also I do affirm the State or Constitution of the Gospel Church, is not the same now as it was under the Law: 'Tis evident all the Jewish Infants were born Members of that Church; it being *national*.

But now the Church is *built up of living Stones* consisting of the Spiritual Seed of Abraham only, not of the natural or carnal Seed of Believers.

And I am perswaded, tho' your Reverend Pastor is for Infant Baptism, yet he will not allow of what you here affirm.

But Sir, if your Infants are all born Church Members, How can Baptism be an initiating rite to them. I allow not, nor you neither, any person to be a right regular member of a Gospel Church until Baptized; But you, in page 35. say, that little Children of believing Parents are Church Members, and so seem to argue for their being Baptized; but if all believers Seed are born Church Members, ours are as good; Church Members as yours, tho' not Baptized.

You in the last place seem greatly to mis the matter in one great case, viz. you distinguish not between the visible and invisible Church under the Law: The invisible Church is but one and the same in every age, that consisteth only of all the elect; we grant, but the visible Church is not the same now as it was under the Law.

That the whole State and Constitution of the national Church of Israel, or natural Seed of Abraham is gone and dissolved, your learned Brethren will not deny, and there is no national Church in its room constituted by our Lord Jesus Christ. So that 'tis not an excommunication of the Jewish only, but an absolute dissolution of their Church State, as Mr. Cotton, Mr. Charnock, Dr. Owen, and many others assert.

In page 99, 100, &c. you again positively declare, that the State of the Christ is the same now as it was under the Law, and hath the same Attributes, and made of the same ingredients, and hath the same Titles, and lives upon the same Food, and was a Baptized Church, and is in the same relation to God and Christ as the Gospel Church doth now.

You proceed to make these things to appear.

1. You begin with the Attributes of the Church under the Law, viz. if you obey my

voice indeed and keep my Covenant, &c. ye shall be a peculiar treasure unto me above all People &c. and ye shall be unto me a Kingdom of Priests, and in holy Nation, Exod. 19. 5, 6. You quote also, Psal. 135. 4. 31. *Thou art God, O Lord, God of Israel.*

1. Answer, Tho' they upon their obedience and keeping Gods Covenant had such promises, yet 'tis evident that they were a National Church: God took the whole House of Israel into a visible External Covenant Church State, and as so considered separated them from all other Nations and People in the World, to be a peculiar people and Treasure (in that Covenant) unto himself; and in this sense, he was said federally, or by Covenant to be Married to the whole House of Israel, and became an Husband, to them; see Jer. 31. 31. God there made a promise to Israel and Judah, viz. I will make a new Covenant, &c. not according to the Covenant I made with your Fathers in the day that I took them by the Hand, to bring them out of the Land of Egypt, which Covenant they broke, although I was an Husband to them, saith the Lord, Jer. 32. Now in that Covenant God made with them when he brought them out of the Land of Egypt, he gave them their Legal Church State and many External Earthly Blessings, Laws and carnal Ordinances; and like as a Husband cares and provides for the Wife, so did God care and provide for them and preserve them so long as that Law (I mean the Law of their Husband) did continue: But that Law is now dead, Rom. 7. 4. And God is now no longer such a Husband to them: Nor hath he Married any other External Nation or People (as so considered) in the World: But now God in the Gospel Covenant is an Husband indeed to them he was a Typical Husband; nor is the Gospel Church Married to the Lord by that old Covenant Law, but by the new Covenant, which is not according to the old; Moreover, they not keeping that Covenant were not such a peculiar treasure to the Lord, as Believers are to him in the New Covenant: Christ hath undertook for all the true members of his mystical Body, they are married to him for ever and they are to him an Eternal excellency, therefore the legal Jewish visible Church differed from the Gospel Church: Yet

2. I also grant that all those under the Law who were members of the invisible Church, or elect ones, were as choice a treasure to God as any Believers are now, and in the like safe condition.

3. 'Tis evident that the legal Church of the Jews was not made up of the same matter, or ingredients, as the Gospel Church is; for according to the Institution of the Gospel Church, none ought to be made members of it but Believers only. But in the Jewish Church the fleshy or carnal Seed were admitted by Gods ordination and appointment, God did allow of the fleshy Seed as such then to be members of that Church, but he doth not allow of such to be in the Gospel Church.

'You mention, in Page 100. *that in Exod. 24.*

'31. *And thou shalt make a Candlestick of pure Gold, &c.* and you hint this was the Church and the ordinances of God: And therefore the ingredients are the same under the Gospel as the Church was under the Law.

Answer, I Though the Candlestick of pure Gold had been a shadow or Figure of some thing to come, and that it referred not to the legal Church, but to the Church under the Gospel, and this being so, how can this prove that Church consisted of the same matter and ingredients as the Gospel Church does?

'3. You say that the Church of God under the Mosaic Law, lived upon the same Spiritual Food as the Church of Christ doth now, &c. Page 93.

1. *Answer,* All that were of the mystical Body of Christ then, 'tis true, did feed on the same Spiritual food.

2. But pray consider what you say. Can any of those that feed on the Flesh of Christ and drink his Blood, perish? for 'tis evident, many who (are said to) Eat of the same Spiritual Meat, and drank the same Spiritual Drink, perished in the Wilderness, 1 Cor. 10: 5, 6, 7, 8.

3. They all Eat the same Manna that Caleb and Joshua did, which is called Heavenly or Spiritual Meat, and Drank of the Water out of the Rock that was a Typ, of Christ. The Jews, say our Annotations, Eat the same Spiritual Meat that we do now; they in the Type, we in the Antitype; they as a Church had but the Shell comparatively, and we the Kernel: they had the shadow, we the substance; their Ordinances were called Carnal Ordinances and their promises Earthly, ours are Spiritual Ordinances, and better promises: Therefore the Church under the Gospel does not feed on the same food which the Church did under the Law.

'4. You say the Church under the Law was Baptized, Men Women and Children. And there can be no true Church but what is so now.

'You mention that in 1 Cor. 10. 1. 2. Here is a Church, say you Baptized, &c. and not one of them Dipped or Duck'd over Head and Ears.

Answer, You mistake, the Jewish Church was no Baptized Church, they had no Ordinance of Baptism, this was but a Typical Baptism; but if they were) as they passed through the Sea) Baptized, and yet only Sprinkled, by Rain falling upon them from the Cloud, then you will make the Church of Israel all Anabaptists, for they were all Sprinkled after they passed through the Sea, see Exod. 24. 8. and Moses took the Blood and Sprinkled it on the People, both the Book and all the People, Heb. 9. 19.

'Tis evident you by this render them to be all Rebaptized, should what you say be granted.

2. But Sprinkling is not Baptizing; nor was that a real, but a Typical Baptism, i.e. when they passed through the Sea; nor was their Children any more Baptized, than was that mixt People which were with them; for so 'tis said and much Cattel also: But that Typical Baptism bears great Analogy with Dipping, as Mr. Poole's Annotations well observes on the place. The Apostle useth that term in regard (say they) of the great Analogy betwixt Baptism (as it was used) the persons going down into the Waters and being Dipped in them, and the Israelites going down into the Sea, the great receptacle of Water; tho' the Water at that time was gathered on heaps on either side of them, yet they seemed buried in the Water. This they give (from some) as the most probable sense of the place. And,

This being so you need not call the Anabaptists to wonder at, what you thought you had got here.

Do you think that among the Jews that passed through the Sea, there were not some Unbelievers as well as among that mixt People; will you plead for the Baptizing of Prophane and ungodly persons? for this will justify their being Baptized as far forth as that of the Infant Seed of Believers.

Thus I have answered all your arguments, to prove there is no difference betwixt the State and Nature of the Gospel Church, and that under the Law; and further to convince you of your mistake in pleading for such a Church, take Dr. Owens sentiments and some other Reverend Independents of a Gospel Church, and of the Dissolution of the Jewish Church.

Question

Question, *What is an Instituted Church of the Gospel?* (he answers.)

Answer. A society of persons called out of the World, or their natural Worldly state, by the Administration of the Word and Spirit, unto obedience of the Faith or knowledge and Worship of God in Christ joynted together in an Holy Band, or by special agreement for the exercise of the Communion of Saints in due observation of all the Ordinances of the Gospel. *Catech.* p. 19.

See also Page 91. how he distinguishes a Gospel Church from the Church under the Law, which he calls a National Church.

Again, he saith, Page 93. the National Church of the Jews with all the Ordinances of it, being removed and taken away the Lord Christ, hath appointed particular Churches or united Assemblies of Believers, &c. See Reverend Mr. Ford's Gospel Church opened, Chap. 1. Page 5. where he gives a right description of a Gospel Church Instituted by Christ, viz. a society of Godly Christians who give themselves first to the Lord and then to one another, &c.

In Chap. 3. Page 22. he shews the matter of a Gospel Church more fully, and that it doth consist only, of regenerate and converted persons; Such as are Married to, and have put on Christ, such that are savingly, and powerfully enlightened, and enlivened, quickened, and convinced of Sin, of Righteousness, and Judgment.

Now are Infants capable of these things, again, he says, Page 25. that all Church Members ought to be sincere hearted Believers, &c.

Where is your Infant Church Membership, if what these worthy Ministers say, be right as be sure it is? I cite these Authors to convince you that you have not a right notion of a Gospel Church, in that you say it differs not from the Church of the Jews which was national; if you are no Independent, but are for a National Church, bring forth your arguments; but first consult Dr. Owen, &c.

The Dr. saith further, viz. that God doth require regeneration as an indispensable condition in a Member of his Church, a Subject of his Kingdom; for his Temple is now built of living Stones 1 Pet. 2. 5. Men Spiritual and savingly quickened from their Death in Sin, and by the Holy Ghost (whereof they are made partakers) made a meet ha-

bitation for God, Eph. 2. 21, 22. 1 Cor. 3. 16. &c. Page 108.

Also see Reverend Mr. Cotton of New England on the Covenant, speaking of the Ax being laid to the Root of the Trees, Mat. 3. 9. Page 177, 178.

The first is, saith he, the Root of Abrahams Covenant, which this People much trusted upon, and that is that which John Baptist speaks of is the Ax laid to the Root of the Trees, think not to say with in your selves, we have Abraham to our Father, ver. 8. So that all their confidence they had in Abrahams Covenant, Temple, and Tabernacle, and such things, is burnt up, and so they have no Root left them to stand upon. But 2ly. The Lord he saith hath cut us off from the righteousness of our Parents and from boasting of his Ordinances.

Again, he saith, it is spoken of the Ministry of John Baptist, which did burn as an Oven, and left them neither the Root of Abrahams Covenant, nor the Branches of their own good works; he cutteth them off from the Covenant of Abraham and so by cutting them off from the root, he leaveth them no ground to trust to, Page 21, 22. you say the new creature in the Womb, or in the Cradle, is as perfect and complete in all its lineaments as in the oldest Saints on Earth, Page 40. &c.

Answer, Sir, do not mistake your self, if Infants are any of them regenerated in the Womb, then Regeneration in them is the first, birth but Regeneration is a being born again, or a second Generation which is wrought by the Holy Spirit, therefore it can't proceed from believing Parents in any wise, they can by their Faith contribute nothing to the second Birth: Now shew at what time 'tis that regeneration is wrought in your Infants. O take heed; for tho' God doth regenerate the Souls of dying Infants, that are saved. Yet what is this to the Infants of Believers, as such?

Besides, if John Baptist, or Jeremiah the Prophet were Regenerated in the Womb, or any other Infants, then it would follow they were not born Children of wrath as others: Nor could their Regeneration be called a being born again (as I hinted before) but their first Birth must be so called.

You I see apply those Scriptures where our Lord Jesus speaks of the Adult, to Infants, as that, Mark 16. 16. John. 3. 3. So that Infants

Infants by your notion are required to believe and to be born again; say you, in Page 24, 25. Challenge Mr. Collins in the name of the Lord to produce but one Text of Scripture that doth discover any other way or means, wherein God hath ordained and appointed to save Elect dying Infants in; differing in any point or part of it, from that wherein he saves Adult believers? Again in Page 19. say you, where will you find two ways for the saving Elect Persons; &c.

Answer, As to the way of Salvation, 'tis we grant but one, viz. *Christ is the way, nor is there Salvation in any other*: But the mode or manner may differ about the Application or means of that one way in some points, as may appear to all, viz.

1. The Adult (except Idiots) are not saved without the Act and exercise of Faith, dying Infants are. 2ly. The Adult are not saved without actual repentance, but dying Infants are. 3ly. The Adult are not saved without Mortification of Sin, taking up the Cross, and following of Christ. But Infants are saved without any of these, or any other Sacred Acts of obedience whatsoever; and yet will you say the way (as to the Mode or manner) of the Salvation of dying Infants, differs in no one point from Adult persons: How will you prove that 'tis the habit of Faith, and not the Act of Faith, that applies Christs merits and Righteousness to the Soul in adult persons: is it not from the habit, the Soul is enabled to believe, and say hold on Christ; and is it not thus that Christ saves the Adult, and doth he just so and in the same mode or manner save dying Infants?

As to the producing one Text in the Case, I say the Holy Ghost is wholly silent as touching the way or manner of the application of Christs merits, to dying Infants, or how their sinful natures are sanctified; yet that the modes differ in many respects, as I have shewed, is evident.

As to what you say in Page 43. I ask, how do you know but that some of the dying Infants of Infidels may be elected as well as some Infants of believers, and so in as good a condition? Nay, how do you know but that all Infants dying in Infancy may be elected? Sure I am, naturally all are born in Sin, and I know no difference in that respect, nor is there any when grown up till grace is infused: 'tis grace and not the natural Birth that makes any difference between the Children of Be-

lievers, and the Children of unbelievers; and I do affirm, till Children have actual Faith, or do believe and repent, they have no right to the Ordinance of Baptism, nor have you proved the contrary, nor ever will.

The Church of England acknowledg the same, viz. that Infants are not able to perform Faith and Repentance, the two great prerequisites of Baptism, by reason of their tender age, therefore they have found out sureties to ingage for them.

In Page 57. you greatly abuse Mr. Collins, in saying that he allows not Elect dying Infants, to be in the Covenant of Grace. Doth it follow, because he denies the Infants of believers, as such, to be in the Covenant of grace, therefore he denies elect Infants to be in the Covenant of Grace? Sir, you ought, not to bear false witness against your neighbour, as you have done; he will tell you and hath told, you that all that are saved, are in the Covenant of Grace.

Reader, Pray note how disengenuous this Man seems to be, and how he hath strangely encumbered the present controversy, in talk of habitual grace in dying; Infants for what is that to the purpose, since he refers not to such Infants of believers that live? he himself acknowledges that all their Infants who live have not the habit of Faith: Nor can he prove any of them have it, or such that die either; therefore unless no other but dying Infants were baptized by the *Pedo Baptists*, this can no ways concern the controversy.

2. Consider, that since those supposed habits in Infants of believers, do not appear to us, nor do we know which they are, what ground is there to Baptize any of them? For what appears not is not (as to us.) Should we Baptize any Adult persons in whom no Fruit, Sign, or demonstration of Faith appears than what appears in Infants, certainly we should be worthy of the greatest blame imaginable: For 'tis evident that in all whosoever that are the true subjects of Baptism, ought the habits of Faith not only to be, but the Act, confession and fruits of it also. True, we might plead thus; what tho' we see no fruits of Faith in some, yet they may be elected, and the habit of Faith may be in them: Nay, this allowed, viz. that they may Baptize all the Infants of Believers promiscuously, supposing some are true Subjects and have habitual Faith, why say, I may they not also Baptize (by the same argument)

the

the Infants of Infidels or Unbelievers, since among them may be some elected also; and if so, why not as much the habit of Faith as any Elect Infant of Believers?

To conclude with this, take three or four Arguments.

Arg. 1. That which cannot be proved of this nature from the word of God, nothing being directly or indirectly spoken about it, is absurd and vain for any person to assert.

But it cannot be proved from the word of God that one Infant of Believers or any other, have habitual Faith; there being nothing directly or indirectly spoken about it, ergo 'tis absurd and vain for any person to assert that any Infant of Believer hath habitual Faith.

Arg. 2. 'Tis forbid, and a sinful thing for any to pry into Gods secrets: All they that pry into the way how God applies the merits of Christ to dying Infants, and sanctifieth them, do pry into Gods Secrets, ergo 'tis forbid and a sinful thing to pry into that, &c.

The Text says positively, secret Things belong unto God, not unto us. That is, such secret things which God hath not made known to his dearest Children; for we deny not but some things that were kept secret, are now revealed, and some things also that are made known to the godly, are kept secret from the wicked; hence 'tis, said the *Secrets of the Lord are with them that fear him, and he will shew them his Covenant*, Psal. 25. 14. The Covenant of grace that is hid from others is revealed to believers; they understand the nature, Blessings, and duties of it; they know no person can be saved but by the Grace of God in this Covenant, nor without the merits of Christ and Sanctification: But yet how the merits of Christ or the blood of the Covenant is applied to Infants that die, or how they are Sanctified is no where revealed to the godly (therefore one of Gods Secrets) if this Man knows it, let him shew where it is written, or hath he it by Revelation?

But this Man says Page 129. That the Salvation of all the Elect is revealed; and Christ saith, *there is nothing covered that shall not be revealed, and hid that shall not be known*.

Answer, Sure those words must be taken

with restriction, for there are many things not revealed, and tho' it is revealed that all the Elect are saved and Sanctified by Christ, yet shew me where 'tis revealed or made known that Infants have habitual Faith.

Arg. 3. They who have had an Habit of Faith infused into them, can never lose it.

But such Infants that live may lose your supposed Habit of Faith; Therefore.

Such Infants never had an Habit of Faith infused into them. For proof of the Major Proposition, See 1 John 3. 9. The Seed remains in him, Luke 22. 32. I have prayed for thee, that thy Faith fail not.

Arg. 4. Those Infants who have your supposed Habit of Faith infused into them are Regenerated, and when grown up to maturity, need no other Regeneration; But those Infants when grown up to maturity do need Regeneration; Therefore.

Those Infants have no such Habit of Faith infused into them.

If he should say those habits infused in Infancy do regenerate their Soul, let him prove it: How doth it come to pass then that some of the Children of Believers are not regenerated till they are (may be) 30 or 40 or 50 years old? Strange that such habits should be in them, and yet lie asleep so long, and evil habits predominate in them till that time.

This Man in Page 45. positively affirms, that some Children have had Faith tho' he cannot prove any Infants have it that are now living:

If he by Children means Infants, I do deny it, and bid him prove what he says, for the Text he mentions in Luk. 1. 41. proves no such thing: What tho' the Babe leaped in the womb of Elizabeth, doth that prove the Babe had faith or the habit of it? Neither doth that in 2 Tim. 1. 5.

What tho' St. Paul was perswaded that Timothy had when an Adult person, like unfeigned faith that was in his Gran mother Lois, and in his Mother Eunice, doth that prove he had the habit of Faith in him when an Infant?

If you say that the habit of Grace may be in a person, and yet not appear, and nor influence or dispose the person according to the nature and quality of it, you may as well say there may be a principle of life in a person and yet he may be dead, or have no Life, Sense, feeling, or motion in him; or there may be Fire,

Fire, and no Heat, a Sun and no light, Water and no moisture; also you contradict all Divines and wise Men in the World in their notions about a habit of Grace or vital Principle: they say where these habits are there is Divine Life, there is a Spirit of love and other Graces, whereby as their understandings are possessed with knowledge of the excellencies of Gods ways, so their wills are seasoned by the power of those habits, and as the old nature is the habit of Sin, so the new nature is the habit of Grace; where the habit of Faith is, they tell you there is a ready disposition to every good work, and as 'tis ready in respect of disposition so it is in the activity of motion, yea that 'tis naturally active according to its Divine nature; and voluntary active. And where these habits are there is a kind of natural necessity of motion from life and habit, &c.

Now if these habits do remain in any Infants of Believers that live: How comes it to pass there is none of these effects and Operations, but the direct contrary till new habits be infused?

If you say these habits may be quite lost, then there is a possibility of falling quite from true Grace.

Reverend Dr. Owen in his discourse of the Holy Spirit, Page 416. saith, 'That the habit of Grace is a virtue, a Power, a Principle of Spiritual Life, wrought, created, infused into our Souls, and laid in all the faculties of them constantly abiding and unchangeably residing in them. —

And again saith, this abideth always in, and with all that are sanctified. — And hereby are they prepared, disposed and enabled unto all duties of obedience.

Thus you see that there is not in any Infants of Believers that live, any habit of Faith, and if you still affirm it you will run upon one Rock or another which will sink your Ship down to the bottom without remedy.

In Page 41. Mr. Shute reflects upon Mr. Collins because he calls Infants ignorant Babies, See his words, viz. 'He seems to make the ignorance of young Infants to be too hard a matter for the Wisdom and Power of God, and renders Infants wholly incapable of receiving the Seeds of Grace.

Answer, Doth Mr. Collins question the wisdom and power of God, because he affirms Infants are morally incapable of those habits of Faith which are in Adult persons? What cannot God do? no doubt he that placed in Infants the Seed or habit of natural knowledge, will, affections, &c. can inspire Infants with the habits of Divine Grace, nay, and as easily bring those Natural and Divine habits in their Infancy when infused, into Acts and Exercise also, according to their distinct natures and Operations as in the Adult: But for any to assert that God doth this is the business, and 'tis that which we do deny, and say, God infuses no such habits into any Infants (that we know of) who are out of a moral capacity to Act and improve those habits, according as they dispose, incline, and empower all that have them.

2. And let it be also considered whether this Man doth not go about to limit the holy one of Israel: When he argues that because God saves and sanctifies the Adult by infusing the habits of Grace into them &c. that therefore God must that way and no other, sanctify and apply the Blood and righteousness of Christ to dying Infants.

We know that Men can differently apply the same medicine to a sick person, and yet it shall have the same effect in curing: So (say we may God some other way apply Christs merits to dying Infants and sanctify them (which we know not of) besides his infusing the same habits which believers are inspired withall, who is a free agent and whose ways are wonderful and past finding out.

C H A P. III.

Proving that Infants of Believers, as such, are not in the Covenant of Grace God made with Abraham; and that there was a twofold Covenant made with Abraham, one that peculiarly referred to his Natural Seed, as such; and the other to his Spiritual Seed, as such; with a full Answer and Confutation of what Mr. Shute hath said in his last reply to Mr. Collins, and to Benjamin Keach, in his Treatise, The Ax lay'd to the Root, about the Covenant of Grace, and that of Circumcision.

I shall pass by several things in your Answer, because they are over, and over, fully answered, in our late Treatise wrote on this Controversie, as that in page 44. of your Book concerning *Federal Holiness*, from 1 Cor. 7. 14. See our Answer to the *Armenian Society*, and *Rebber Rectified*, and that in page 71. about the promise, *Acts* 2. 38. But to proceed.

This first of all the Reader is desired to consider of, and that carefully, that our Adversary hath dealt very unfairly with my Reverend Brother Collins, I hope it is through his Ignorance or great oversight, viz. first, he positively concludes and takes it for granted, that Mr. Collins hath endeavour'd to prove the Covenant of Grace which God made with, or rather promis'd to Abraham is dissannulled and taken away. Secondly, that Mr. Collins by his often repeated distinction of *the Covenants of peculiarity God made with Abraham*, doth mean and intend the Covenant of Grace, when this is as far from his intention and expressions any where in his Book or Judgment, as the East is from to the West: I have seen many Men undertake in Controvertible Points, but never saw any (except one) abuse his Antagonist worse, nor after such a sort; 'tis evident there was two Covenants contained in those transactions of God with Abraham, one peculiarly respected only his Natural Seed or Off-spring, as such, which Mr. Collins calls the Covenant of peculiarity, (as others have done before him) which Circumcision was a Sign of, and this he hath proved, was not the Covenant of Grace which God promised to Abraham for the Covenant of Grace God Promised to him, did not peculiarly relate to Abraham's Natural Seed that were Elect Persons; but to all the Gentiles also, who believe in Christ; for that comprehends none but the Elect, or the

true Spiritual Seed of Abraham, as such. Reader, if you read Mr. Collins first Book, or his answer to Mr. Shute, you will find this is as plainly lay'd down by him, as any thing could well be: I am afraid that this Man's over-heated zeal would not suffer him distinctly to read over, and seriously weigh, what Mr. Collins hath wrote and said upon this account, before he attempted to write an Answer, for thro' this gross mistake (as one that hath read Mr. Shutes Book, observed and told me) he hath wrote near twenty Leaves to no purpose, i. e. to prove that which no body denies, viz. that the Covenant of Grace God promised to Abraham, is not dissolved, cast out, or dissannulled, but abides the same for ever, which we all as steadfastly believe as Mr. Shute, therefore he has but set up here on this respect, a Man of Straw, and then fights with it; And upon search and examination of Mr. Shutes reply, I see that what the Gentleman told me is very true, and that those Leaves do begin about 74th. page and so on: And in the said 74th. page Mr. Shute begins with this easie assay, viz. To prove the Covenant of Grace God made with (or rather promised unto) Abraham, abideth for ever and ever, he urgeth that blessed Text *Psalms* 89. 34, 35, &c. *My Covenant I will not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my Lips; once have I sworn by my my Holiness that I will not lie unto David, &c.* Do we say or Imagine, that the promise of the Covenant of Grace God made to Abraham, is abrogated? God forbid: for that stands firm for ever and ever, as the Spring of all our comfort and consolation in Life and Death; being confirmed by the Oath of God, who cannot lie, *Heb.* 6. 13, 15, 16, 17, 18. and so doth the Invisible and Mystical Church, or Body of Christ, remain and abide for ever also,

also, against which the *Gates of Hell* shall never prevail.

But the question is, *viz.* Whether or no, there was not a Covenant of *Peculiarity* made with *Abraham* and his Natural Seed, (or Offspring) as such, *viz.* a Covenant that only, did belong or appertain to the Jews, in which no-believing Gentiles, nor their Seed, as such, were concerned, of which Circumcision was a Sign, for this is that which we affirm.

Now Reader, observe Mr. *Collins's* Argument, and Mr. *Skutes* Reply in his 76. page *viz.*

'The Natural Branches are broken off, *Ergo*, Childrens visible in Covenanting is repealed: thus Mr. *Collins*, Take the Answer as followeth.

'Now Sir you shall see, saith Mr. *Skute*, *That this doth no more prove, that the Children of believing Parents, were cast out of the everlasting Covenant which God made with Abraham, than, &c.*

Answer, By the Everlasting Covenant, you mean the Covenant of Grace, that God promised to *Abraham*. Friend, we say all the Elect Infants of believers, or of unbelievers were Included in that Covenant, and they are not, nor can they be cast out of it: But you mistake the Argument, 'tis not about the Spiritual Seed, but the Natural Seed of *Abraham*; the Controversie lies not, about who are Members of the Invisible, but who are Members of the Visible Church in Gospel days; the Argument is about Childrens Visible in Covenanting. I am sorry you distinguish no better, either you do not see where the Stress of the Point lies, or else will not see it.

I ask you whether there was no Covenant made with *Abraham*, that belonged to his Natural Seed as such only? and whether Circumcision did not belong to that Covenant, and so a Covenant of Peculiarity? 2. *e.* in which Gentile believers, and their Seed were no ways concerned; was not Christ to come only of *Abraham* and his Seed, according to the flesh? Besides, if this were not so, Circumcision could not be said to be an advantage to the Jews, (upon the account of the Law) above the Gentiles, *Rom.* 3. 1, 2. is it not said *unto them* (that is, the Jews) *appertained the Covenants, &c.* *Rom.* 9. 4. is not here more Covenants than one? 'tis not Covenant, but Covenants: Now the Covenant of Circumcision that belonged to them, as they were the Natural Seed of *Abraham*, (tho' wicked Persons)

and so did the giving of the Law and Service of God under that dispensation: but the Covenant of Grace belongs only to *Abraham's* Spiritual Seed. First such of them that proceeded from his Loyns; and Secondly, those of the Gentiles, also that were comprehended in Gods Election of Grace; hence Christ saith, *he was not sent, but to the lost Sheep of the House of Israel*, that is, to all that God hath given him among the Jews, *not sent*, that is not *first*, the promise runs first to the Jews, to the Jews first, and also to the Gentiles, *Rom.* 1. 16.

1. Let this therefore be carefully considered, *viz.* that God made a twofold Covenant or two Covenants with *Abraham* and his Seed one a formal Covenant, the other held forth in promise, which by and by I shall further evince.

2. That the Gospel Covenant run first to all the Elect that were the Natural off-spring of *Abraham*, and then to the Gentiles, and from hence 'tis said, *Rom.* 11. That when the Jews are called and brought in again, they shall be grafted into their own Olive-Tree. Their own because the Covenant of Grace or Gospel Covenant, first in the blessings of it, was to them or to such amongst them, that were Gods Elect. 2. Because the true Olive doth according to Gods eternal purpose and free Grace; Peculiarity belong to all the Elect and called ones of God,—but

3. Let it be consider'd that there was a National Covenant of Peculiarity also, made with *Abraham's* Carnal Seed, as such in which Circumcision, the Land of Canaan, the giving forth of the Law on Mount Sinai, their Visible Church, and Church-membership, and all the Statutes, Ordinances, and Services of the Law did appertain, and this brings me to what Mr. *Skute* hath said by way of answer to my Sermon on *Matth.* 3. *Now is the Ax laid to the Root of the Trees.* Where I do not only assert, but prove that two Covenants were continued in Gods Transactions with *Abraham*; but first observe, Reader, his abuses and misconstructions of my words, as in page 115. as if I had left out on purpose the 7. verse in *Gen.* 17. where the Covenant of Circumcision is called, an everlasting Covenant. 'Tis evident I did not only mention that verse, but answered Mr. *Flavels* Argument drawn therefrom, as in part 2. page 13. But still he affirms positively again that in all my Discourse, I have not so much as named this, *viz.* an Everlasting Covenant, and so compares me with the Devil, who left out part of

of a Scripture; see his Book page 116. Now this being a matter of Fact, let such who are in Communion with him consider it, for if they read my Sermons, page 13, 14. they will see that 'tis a great untruth. What tho' I left it out at such times when the writing it was not at my purpose in Hand, seeing I mention it at another, and answer what our opponents draw therefrom? In page 117. he says, *If there were two Covenants made with Abraham, then there would have been three Covenants in being at once, two of Works, and one of Grace.*

Answer, This I have fully answered in those Sermons called, *the Ax layd at the Root*, see page 14, 15, 16, 18. *Second Part.* Thus you will find I express my self, viz. Tho' there is but one Covenant of Work's yet there was more than one Addition or Administration of the said Covenant. This is evident, altho' given upon a different End, Purpose, and Design by the Lord: The Covenant of Works was primarily made with Adam; yet another addition or ministraton of it, was given on Mount Sinai, and to that Covenant, I there prove Circumcision did appertain, *Ax 2d. Part* page 17, 18. Also I there shewed that tho' there is but one Covenant of Grace, yet there were several distinct Additions or Administrations of that. Also, in page 124. he misrepresents my words again, he cites an Objection I mention in page 25. *part 1. viz.*

Object. *If Infants as such were not included in the Covenant of Grace God made with Abraham, how can dying Infants be saved?*

My Answer is, Must Infants of believers, as such, be comprehended in that Covenant, God made with Abraham, or else can they not be saved? how then were any dying Infants saved before Abraham's days, or before the Covenant was made with him?

Now Mr. Shute says, page 125. That I have answered this Objection; as if there had been no Covenant of Grace before that time God did declare and make that Covenant with Abraham.

Answer, I will appeal to all Men, whether or no the very purport of my Answer is not to signify that the Covenant of Grace was from the beginning, made primarily with Christ before the World begun for us, and that those Infants that were saved before Abraham's time, were saved by the said Covenant of Grace, otherwise I had said nothing; the very Stress of my Argument lyes upon that foot of account.

In page 132. Mr. Shute he says *if God made two distinct Covenants with Abraham and his Seed, then.*

1. *There must be that in the one that is peculiar to his Spiritual Seed.*

2. *There must be that in the other that is peculiar to his Carnal Seed; but we find (saith he) it is altogether unscriptural; for*

1. *Both the Seeds of Abraham had a right to all the External Benefits and Priviledges of the everlasting Covenant which God made with Abraham, very few excepted.*

Answer, I have largely proved in the said Sermons called, *The Ax layd to the Root*, That there were some things in one peculiar to his Spiritual Seed, that no ways related to his Carnal Seed, as such, which proved the Covenant contained in promise to be distinct, page 14, 16. and some things in the other that belonged to his Natural Seed, that appertains not to his Spiritual Seed, as such, of which this Man takes no notice.

I begin there with those things that belonged to Abraham's Natural Seed, as such, as peculiar to them.

1. The first that I Name, is, *That of Gods multiplying his Seed by Isaac.*

2. The Birth of Isaac by Sarah Abraham's Wife, *Gen. 17. 16, 19.*

3. The continuation of his Covenant, with all that should proceed from Isaac according to the Flesh, *Gen. 17. 6.*

4. The coming of Christ out of Isaac according to the Flesh.

5. The bringing the Natural Seed of Abraham by Isaac out of Egypt.

6. The promise of giving his Natural Seed the Land of Canaan for their Possession. Now can any of these things concern, or belong to Abraham's Spiritual Seed, as such, that is, do they concern us Gentiles who do believe?

Observe also, that as these things peculiarly appertained to his Natural Seed, as such; so Circumcision is expressly called Gods Covenant, *Gen. 17. Thou shalt keep my Covenant, every Man Child among you shall be Circumcised, verse 10. And ye shall Circumcise the Flesh of your Fore Skins, and it shall be a token of the Covenant betwixt me and you, verse 8. And I will give unto thee, and to thy Seed after thee, the Land wherein thou art a Stranger, all the Land of Canaan, &c. so Gen. 15. 8.* Now this Covenant and these promises I affirmed, cannot belong to the Spiritual Seed of Abraham as such, page 16: therefore a Covenant of peculiarity; to which he hath given no answer.

Secondly, I have shewed also what those things are, that are Peculiar to the Covenant of Grace, and so to *Abrahams* Spiritual Seed, as such, which Covenant only, was by promise, not a formal Covenant like the other, viz. that of Circumcision, *Gen. 17. 7.*

1. See *Gen. 15. 5. Look towards Heaven, tell the Stars, if thou art able to Number them; and he said unto him, so shall thy Seed be; and he believed in the Lord, and it was counted to him for Righteousness.* This was not in the Covenant of Circumcision, and refers to *Abrahams* numerous Spiritual Seed.

2. So again, *I have made thee a Father of many Nations*; meaning Gentile Believers, as divers Expositors shew.

3. *In thy Seed, shall all the Nations of the Earth be Blessed, Gen. 12. 3. Gen. 18. 18. Gen. 22. 18.* I cited the Apostles words, *Gal. 3. 8. The Scripture foreseeing, that God would Justify the Heathen, through Faith Preached the Gospel to Abraham, saying, in thy Seed shall all the Nations of the Earth be Blessed.*

'Tis remarkable the Holy Ghost does not here refer to the Covenant of Circumcision, *Gen. 17. 7, 8, 9, 10.* But to the free promise of the Covenant of Grace, which *Paul* says positively *Abraham* received not in Circumcision, *Rom. 4. 9, 10. Faith was reckoned to Abraham for Righteousness; how was it then reckoned, when he was in Circumcision, or in Uncircumcision? not in Circumcision, but in Uncircumcision.*

Now I desire it may be well considered by all Christians, that the Covenant of Grace, was only by promise, and no Formal Covenant with any of the Saints under the Old Testament; thus, the Covenant of Grace run to *Adam*, to *Abraham*, to *David*, &c. *as 11, 12.* only by promise, not a Covenant, where there was a mutual stipulation between God and his Elect ones: As in the Covenant of Circumcision, there was between God and *Abraham*, in respect of his Carnal Seed; this *Dr. Owen* asserts also on *Heb. 8. 6. page 227.*

'When God renewed, saith he, the promise of it to *Abraham*, he is said to make a Covenant with him, and he did so; but it was with respect unto other things; especially the proceeding of the promised Seed from his Loins; but absolutely under the Old Testament, it consisted only in a promise. 1. It wanted its solemn confirmation and establishment, by the Blood of the only Sacrifice, which belonged to it. 2. This was wanting, saith he, the Spring, Rule, and Measure of

all the Worship of the Church, this does belong to every Covenant, properly so called, that God makes with his Church, that it be the entire Rule of all the Worship, that God requires of it, which is that which they are to stipulate in their entrance into Covenant with God; but so the Covenant of Grace was not under the Old Testament; thus *Dr. Owen.*

This is further confirmed by those expressions, *Jer. 31. 31. I will make a new Covenant with the House of Israel, &c.* clearly intimating he had not so made it before with any, except it was with Christ as our Head, Representative, and Mediator, with whom it was made for us, and in him with us, before the Foundation of the World, *Tit. 1. 2. 2 Tim. 1. 9.*

Object. Does not *David* say God had made with him an everlasting Covenant, &c.

Answer, I answer, *David* was a Type of Christ, *Psal. 89. 28, 34, 35.* with whom the Covenant of Grace was made before the World began, this therefore refers to the true *David*, who was only able to answer the Condition agreed upon, between the Father and himself as Mediator, For the Covenant of Peace was between them both, *Zech. 6. 13.* For unto us the Covenant of Grace is not a Conditional, but an Absolute Covenant.

I will be their God, and they shall be my People, &c.

To *Adam* the promise runs *The Seed of the Woman shall Bruise the Serpents Head, &c.*

To *Abraham*, *In thy Seed shall all the Families of the Earth be blessed.* In both places it contained only a gracious promise: To *Abraham*, and to his Seed the promise was made; it is not said Covenant, therefore when I say God made a Twofold Covenant with *Abraham*, I mean that there were two Covenants contained in those Covenant Transactings of God with him, one a Formal Covenant with him and his Carnal Seed, which contained a Covenant upon mutual stipulation, which was the Covenant of Circumcision, which *Abraham* and his Carnal Seed subscribed to the other a free promise or Covenant of Grace to him and all is true Spiritual Seed, which is confirmed by Christ's Blood, and which believers consent to, and enter into, when Baptized upon the profession of their Faith, in Gospel days, tho' I deny not, but that they have actual interest in it; as soon as they have Union with Christ, or do believe in him.

Moreover it was through Faith only, in the

the free promise of Christ and in the Covenant of Grace that all the faithful were justified and saved who lived under the old Testament, tho' the Covenant it self was not then formerly a Covenant with them, it being not Ratified nor confirmed by the Blood of Christ or Death of the Testator, nor could it so be till the typical Covenant was taken away.

This being so it follows clearly that the Covenant, *Gen. 17.* was only a peculiar external and Typical Covenant made with Abraham and his carnal Seed, in which, Justification, pardon of sin, Adoption, and Eternal Life was not contained, but in the free Promise only God made to him, that Covenant had in it; it is true, temporal Blessings, apolitical Church state and typical worship, and visible, legal Church Membership given to *Israel* in suberviency to the Gospel Covenant.

And further to prove that the promise of the Covenant of Grace did not belong to Abraham's natural Seed as such, *Paul* shews in *Gal. 3. 16.* Now to Abraham and to his Seed was the promise made; he saith not to seeds, as of many; but to thy Seed, which is Christ.

And therefore saith he, *vers. 29.* and if ye be Christs, then are you Abrahams Seed, and heirs according to the promise.

Ye must say I reckon from Christ, not from Abraham; but Mr. Shute misrepresents me here also, as if I set Abraham before Christ, when 'tis evident I intimated no other thing than this, i. e. you must see your selves first in Christ before you can reckon your selves to be Abrahams Seed: Again, I cited *Page 17. part. 1.* that in *Rom. 9. 7, 8.* Neither because they are the Seed of Abraham are they all Children, but in *Isaac* shall thy Seed be called. 7. That is, they which are the Children of the Flesh, these are not the Children of God. But the Children of the promise are counted for the Seed.

What can be more clear than this, viz. that the natural Seed of Abraham, as such (called here the Children of the Flesh) are not his Spiritual Seed to whom the Covenant of Grace doth belong unto, that is (saith the Apostle) They which are the Children of the Flesh, these are not the Children of God, that is, as such, or as simply so considered: For some of the natural Seed of Abraham, tho' not all, were the Children of the promise; for saith he, they are not all *Israel* that are of *Israel*, *vers. 6.*

This Man meddles not with my arguments, and what he catches up he generally wrongs and abuses me in, rendering me to

Speak that which I speak not nor, intended.

But to proceed (he says) *Page 132. B 1b* 'the Seeds of Abraham had a right to all the eternal benefits and privileges of the everlasting Covenant, God made with Abraham, very few excepted.

Answer, What few he means that are excepted, I know not; but if all the Spiritual Seed of Abraham had right to all the external benefits and privileges of the external Covenant God made with him, then all believing Gentiles and their Elect Infants have, or had a right to circumcision, the giving of the Law, the possession of the Land of *Canaan*, and all other rites of the *Mosaical* Law.

2. If by the everlasting Covenant he means the Covenant of Grace, then all Abrahams natural Seed, as such, a few excepted, have or had a right to Baptism, the Lords Supper and all Gospel Church-privileges; and if so, why were the *Sadducees* and *Pharisees*, and Multitudes more of Abrahams natural Seed refused and not admitted to the external benefits and privileges of the Gospel or Covenant of Grace?

Think not to say, saith John Baptist, within your selves, ye have Abraham to your Father, when they came to be Baptized; he proceeds to prove several things that none denies: As that the Covenant of Works was made with Adam and all mankind in him, and that there is but two Covenants; that all the elect under the Law were in the Covenant of Grace, &c.

Then in *Page 134.* Shews what a Straight he is in, and knows not which to wonder at most.

1. At our boldness and confidence and imposing our fallacious corrupt Doctrins upon the People.

2. Or at the Peoples ignorance to suffer themselves to be so horribly deluded and imposed upon.

Answer, I do not much wonder at such lines, because I know who wrote them, and in what Spirit, but Sir, you should first have proved any Doctrin we maintain to be corrupt and fallacious.

2. That we impose those Doctrins upon the People: Dare you falsely charge and condemn the innocent? we are not yet convicted nor tried at a lawful Bar: But both you and we must appear at a righteous and just tribunal ere long — You proceed to renew your charge against me for leaving out everlasting Covenant. Friend, I quoted those

Verbes

Verſes that concerned the point I had in hand, and have cited that Verſe and answered it too, where circumciſion is called an everlaſting Covenant; ſee *Ax laid to the Root*; and I will now recite what I there wrote.

2. Part Page 13. viz. the Covenant of circumciſion was called an everlaſting Covenant. My Answer there to this, is as followeth.

Answer, 'Tis not unknown to our Opponents that the word *everlaſting*, ſometimes ſignifies no more than a long continuance of time; and ſo extenſive was the promiſe of Gods peculiar favours to the natural Seed of *Abraham*; and the original of their claim therefrom, that the ſeverity of that Law afterwards given to them, was ſo far reſtrained as that notwithstanding their manifold breach of Covenant with God and forfeiture of all legal claims, of their right and privileges in the Land of *Canaan* thereby, that they were never cut off from that good Land and ceaſed to be peculiar People unto God, until the End or period of that time determined by the Almighty was fully come: Which was at the Revelation of the *Meſſiah*, and the ſetting up his Spiritual Temple under the Diſpenſation of the Goſpel; and thus far the word *everlaſting* doth extend. 'Tis ſaid, God promiſed to give the Land of *Canaan* to *Abraham* and to his Seed for ever; and again, *Gen. 17. 8.* for an everlaſting inheritance, whereas 'tis evident they have for many ages been diſpoſſeſſed of it. Nor may this ſeem ſtrange if we conſult other Texts where the ſame Terms are uſed with the like Reſtriction, for the Prieſthood of *Levi* is called an *everlaſting Prieſthood*, *Numb. 25. 13.* And ſo the Statutes to make an Atonement for the Holy Sanctuary, and for the Tabernacle and for the *Ahar*, is called an *everlaſting Statute*, *Levit. 16. 34.* Yet we know they all ended as did the Covenant of circumciſion in Chriſt: See more in Page 14. *Ax laid to the Root.*

1. Now let any perſon ſee what blame this Man doth in Juſtice deſerve for ſaying I have not mentioned the word *everlaſting* in all my Book, viz. *circumciſion being called an everlaſting Covenant*; you alſo ſee, what little argument lies in that to prove the Covenant of circumciſion is a Goſpel Covenant or appertaining to the Covenant of Grace.

Reader, in thoſe Sermons I laid down eleven arguments, proving that the Covenant of Circumciſion was part of the old legal and external Covenant God made with the *Jews* or the natural Seed of *Abraham*, ſo not belonging

to the Goſpel Covenant, and becauſe thou mayeſt not meet with them, I ſhall give thee here the heads or ſum of them as followeth, ſee Page 18. 1. Part.

Arg. 1. Becauſe the Law or Covenant of circumciſion was made, as to the deſign and end of it to ſeparate the natural Seed of *Abraham* in their national Church ſtate, from all other Nations, and to give them the Land of *Canaan*, ſo that they might not mixt themſelves with the Heathen.

1. Will any ſay the Goſpel Covenant or any precept of it; in the end and deſign of it, is inſtituted to ſeparate all believers and their fleſhy Seed as a national Church from all other People in the World? if this be ſo, farewel to all Spiritual incorporated congregations of Chriſtians. See *Dr. Owen*.

2. Doth any Goſpel ordinance aſſure us and our Children of the Land of *Canaan*, or any worldly and earthly Bleſſings, or is not the new Covenant eſta bliſhed upon better promiſes?

Arg. 2. Becauſe ſome who were not in the Covenant of promiſe, had a poſitive right to, and were commanded of God to be circumciſed, as *Iſmael, Eſau, &c.* and all the Male-Children, tho' wicked Mens Children that ſprung from *Iſaac* in their generations, &c. alſo ſome of *Abraham's* Spiritual Seed were not to be circumciſed, nor had they any right there too.

1. As all his Male-Children who died before eight days old.

2. All his Females, who were elected perſons and ſome others, who lived in *Abraham's* Days, as *Melchizedek* and *Zor*, &c.

Arg. 3. Becauſe ſome of *Abraham's* natural Seed to whom circumciſion did belong, were nevertheless denied Goſpel Baptiſm; tho' their plea was *Abraham is our Father*.

1. From hence it follows, circumciſion was no Goſpel Law; for that which gave right to circumciſion was not ſufficient to give right to Goſpel Baptiſm.

2. It alſo appears that the Covenant of Grace, was not the adequate reaſon of circumciſion, but the mere poſitive command of God to *Abraham*; So that if they could prove the Children of believers in the Covenant of Grace, it would nevertheless be no argument to Baptiſe them, unleſs they had a command or ground from Chriſt ſo to do.

For the Covenant God made with *Abraham* ſpeaks nothing of Baptiſm. And had not our Bleſſed Saviour given it forth as an inſtitution

tution of the Gospel, we had never heard of it nor known it had been a duty or ordinance, should we have read the Covenant made with Abraham a thousand times over : Therefore if all they say about the Infant Seed of Believers as such should be granted, being in the Covenant of Grace that God made with Abraham, (which cannot) yet it would not follow from thence, Infants ought to be Baptized for, none ought to be Baptized but such that Christ's Commission and positive command, doth authorize so to be, which are none but those who by preaching, and the working of the Holy Ghost are made Disciples, or do believe ; and make a confession of their Faith ; in matters of mere positively right. We must always keep to the direct will and words of the Law-giver like as Abraham did in circumcision : No adding nor altering no pleading for Females to be circumcised, if Males only are expressed in the institution of it.

Arg. 4. Circumcision could not be a Gospel rite, because all in the Gospel Church, 'tis expressly said, *shall know the Lord*, Jer. 31. 31.

And shall not need to be taught to know him.

Now under the old Legal Covenant Infants were admitted Members of the Jewish Church, who did not know the Lord, but had need when grown up to understanding to be taught to know him ; in this the old Covenant differs from the new ; and old Church Membership from new Church Membership: for our Children before admitted into Gods Church, must know the Lord; we and they too must believe or be made Disciples by teaching ; we must know Christ or fix our Faith on him, in saving knowledge which Infants cannot do.

To the last of these arguments he seems to say some thing ; see Page 119. where he cites these words out of my Sermons, Page 21. viz.

in the old Covenant Infants were Members who did when taken into that Covenant and made members of that Legal Church, not know the Lord.

Mr. Shute says, here I mention but one Covenant, and acknowledg Infants were in that one Covenant: So that he hath confuted himself, and let him or any of their opinion prove by Scripture God did cast young Infants out of that one Covenant ; he hath destroyed his two Covenants by thus contradicting himself ; a Man under his circumstances had need to have a good Memory.

Answer, That Covenant which I mention

was I tell you the Legal Covenant that God made with the whole Church and House of Israel, and how do I contradict my self? Infants I own were Members of the Jewish Church, and doth not the Scripture say, *cast out the Bond-woman and her Son*, &c. is not the old Covenant the Jewish Covenant gone? *did not God take away the first, that he might establish the second?* what Covenant is that which the Apostle says, is took away and disannulled? 'tis not you, will say, the Covenant of Grace.

I also ask you whether the Jewish Church that was founded upon that Old Covenant, is not gone and dissolved? if so what doth your arguing prove, nor is there a new Gospel national Church like the Church of the Jews instituted in the room of the old? since you plead for Infants Church-membership, you must come to the new and last Will and Testament, if Christ hath not willed Infants, their right to Baptism, and Church-membership in the Gospel, they can't have it by the former Testament which is disannulled.

You ask if faith and repentance was not required under the Law, Page 119.

I answer, Not to make any Members of the Jewish Church, you are in Page 120. 121. &c. upon your old argument, that both young and old, Infants and the Adult are saved by faith: We have answered that already. Such that can believe, that Infants do believe or know the Lord, let them, I believe it not, nor can he nor all the Men of the World prove it. I shall repeat the substance of my other arguments, to prove that circumcision did not appertain to the Covenant of Grace.

Arg. 5. Because the Terms of it runs according to the Sinai Covenant, which is said not to be of Faith. *But the Man that doth these things shall live in them*, Gal. 3. 22. Life was promised to their obedience, death threatned to their disobedience: The promises were earthly, &c. and thus runs the Covenant of circumcision, Gen. 17. 9, 10. *Thou shalt keep my Covenant, &c. and I will give to thee, and to thy Seed after thee, the Land of Canaan. And the uncircumcised Man-Child whose Flesh of his Fore-skin is not circumcised, that Soul shall be cut off*, &c. vers. 14.

6. The covenant of circumcision was of the Letter and not of the Spirit, that is, of the Law or first Testament, and not of the Gospel or second Testament, See Rom. 3. 29.

7. That Covenant in which Faith was not reckoned to Abraham for righteousness, was not

not the Covenant of Grace, or Gospel Covenant; but Faith was not reckoned to *Abraham* in circumcision, *ergo*. See *Rom*, 4. 9, 10. See more *Page 22. 1 Part.*

Arg. 8. That Law or Covenant that is contra-distinguished or opposed to the Covenant of Faith, or Gospel Covenant could not be one and the same in nature and quality with it.

But the Apostle lays down the Covenant of circumcision, as contra-distinct or opposed to Faith or the Covenant of Grace, *ergo*.

9. That Covenant or precept that could profit none unless they keep the whole Law perfectly, it could not appertain to the Covenant of Grace, but so 'tis said of circumcision, See *Rom*. 2. 25.

10. That Law or Covenant that obliged those that conformed to it, to keep the whole Law, could not belong to the Covenant of Grace, but so did circumcision oblige, See *Gal*. 5. 3. See our last *Annotators* on that Text.

11. That Covenant that is called a Yoke of Bondage, could not be the Covenant of Grace. But circumcision is called a Yoke of Bondage, *ergo*. See *Act*. 15. *Gal*. 5. 1, 2.

12. All those that are in the Covenant of Grace God promised to *Abraham*, have an undoubted right to all the saving Blessings of the said Covenant, but all those that were in the Covenant of circumcision had not an undoubted right to all the saving Blessings of the Covenant of Grace, *ergo*, &c.

13. All those that are in the Covenant of Grace God promised to *Abraham*, have a sure and strong ground of consolation, that is, Spiritual Consolation; and they should be saved, *Neb*. 6. 13, 14, 15. But many of them that were in the Covenant of circumcision had no sure ground of consolation, that is, Spiritual, nor have many of our Children who are Believers any such ground of consolation, but some of them may perish, *ergo*.

Sir, why did you not answer these arguments? you have said nothing, that is worth regard to me. Also shew if you writ again what profit your Infants receive by Baptism, and in what sense they are in the Covenant of Grace, and how they can be Members of your Churches, and yet are not Members nor received as such, until they actually believe and repent. — But remember if you could prove them in the Covenant of Grace, yet that doth not prove you ought to Baptise

them: Baptism is of mere positive right: You must have authority from Christ to Baptise them, or you sin if you do it.

In *Page 136.* You tell us, *That the form of circumcision was transient, and is ceased — Yet the Essential part thereof remaineth in the Flesh, for nothing could be more a Type of Baptism than Circumcision, &c.*

Answer, I promised to forbear hard words; but a Man that argues thus should be severely dealt with one way or another, *i. e.* either by writing, or rather in a Church way be severely reprov'd. Does the Essential part of circumcision remain in the Flesh, then the mark it made in the Flesh doth no doubt remain, for I know not what was else the essential part of it remaining in the Flesh save that, the form was the cutting off the fore-skin.

If you had said the essential thing signified by it doth remain in the Heart of true believers, you had said something to the purpose — But.

Did ever any Man before now intimate that Baptism is the essential part of circumcision? If this were so, circumcision could not be circumcision in the Flesh without Baptism, because a thing cannot be where the essential part of it is wanting.

He proceeds to give a reason why the essential part of circumcision remains in the Flesh, *Page 136. viz.* how saith he, could 'this token of the Covenant be everlasting, if the Essence thereof was dissolved upon the coming in of the Gospel? This cannot be, for it is a tradition in it self; for everlasting and dissolution are opposites.

1. *Answer*, This Man by this argument gives cause to fear he may ere long plead for circumcision, and turn Jew, for he is for the essential part of it, and that in the Flesh too already: I am sorry he understands no better the difference between a Type and the Antitype, for there can no part of the Type remain (much less the essential part of it when the Antitype is come) — But he runs into this error from his ignorance of the word *Everlasting*; which as I have shewed is sometimes to be taken with restriction, and refers to a long period of time. — He may as well say *Aaron's* Priesthood remains, or the essential part of it, because called an *Everlasting Priesthood*, *Numb*. 25. 13.

2. We deny Baptism was the Antitype of circumcision : To prove it was not, I have given many reasons, which he answers not.

1. Both Circumcision and Baptism were in full force together for some time, even from the time *John* Baptized, until the Death of Christ.

2. Because one thing that is a figure or shadow cannot come in the room of, as the Antitype of another thing that is a figure: See 12 Reasons more in *Reitor Rectified* Page 4. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, &c.

One of them Mr. *Stute* takes notice of, which is this, *viz.* Circumcision belonged only to Male Children, Baptism belongs to Males and Females who believe.

'To this he answers, *that the Females was included in the Males, because Man is the head and representative of the Woman, and Woman is a part of Man.*

Answer, Why then let your Females be Baptized in your Males : for from hence it will follow when your Males are Baptized, your Females are Baptized also, as much as the Jews Females were circumcised.

Neither need your Wives eat the Lords Supper, for when you receive, they receive it. But sure, Sir, you mistake; your learning fails you: Will the food you eat feed your Wife? or will your Faith serve her? Doth she believe when you believe, because she is part of you, as here you intimate?

In page 12. 7. he reflects on me for saying, God may have many ways to save dying Infants, which we know not: He can apply the Benefits and Merits of Christ's Blood to them in ways we are wholly ignorant of, &c. For this I Quoted Dr. Taylor Bishop of Down.

Take his answer, *viz.* Pray take notice this Man contradicts himself; for in page 21. (he saith) They must believe and repent and bring forth good Fruits, &c. Yet here, &c. saith, God hath many ways to save dying Infants: And in page 30. for this Mr. *Shute* says, There is no saving of any Person, Old or Young, without the Grace

of Faith. *Then you see there is* (saith he) *but one way to eternal Life.*

1. Answer, I cannot see but that you have by your arguing, thus excluded all Infants that dye, out of the Kingdom of Heaven; for if no Infant can be saved, unless they Believe, Repent, and bring forth good Fruits as the Adult must, if they are saved, how is it possible any Infant can be saved?

2. I did not contradict my self, I spoke not there of Infants, but of Adult Persons: And why did you before only plead for habitual Faith to be in dying Infants, that go to Heaven, since now you here intimate that they must believe? For you cite Mark 16. 16. *He that believes and is Baptized, shall be saved, and he that believes not shall be damned.* If our Saviour in these words refers to Infants, as well as to Men and Women; I am mistaken, and all Learned Men I ever met with. Friend, it will not help you to say Christ performed these conditions for them, *viz.* Faith and Repentance, page 123. Nor doth the Meritorious death of Christ, without the infusing divine Faith into the Soul, render any Man a Believer: Besides, tho' 'tis by the Grace and power of Christs Spirit, that we Believe, Repent, and bring forth good Fruit. Yet 'tis we that Believe, and Repent, the act is ours, tho' enabled by Divine Power, to do it. Now prove that God gives any Infant such power to Believe and Repent, &c. who know not the object of Faith, nor have any understanding. Friend, they are more excusable, who say God may have many ways to apply the Blood and Merits of Christ, and so Save and Sanctify dying Infants, which we know not of, than you who assert that not one of them can be saved unless they Believe, &c. and if they do not do so, they shall be Damned: For you positively affirm there is no way of Gods saving Elect dying Infants, differing in any point from that of his saving Adult persons: 'tis well you may Err, for should what you say be true, 'tis enough to bring sorrow and amazement upon Godly Parents, about the State of their dying Infants.

C H A P. IV.

Wherein Mr. Shutes arguments to prove, our Churches no Churches, and our Baptism a counterfeit, are examined and answered.

1. **I**N page 186. he asserts, That Adult believers have nothing to do with the Ordinance after the first Institution or Plantation of the Gospel in a Family, unless it be such, whose Parents deprived them of it in their Infancy: But Baptism of Right is devolved upon the Infant Seed of Believers.

1. Answer, If this be true, then the Children of unbelievers have no right to Baptism, neither as Infants nor when Adult believers, if the right be devolved upon the Infants of believers.—This in the first place is enough to convince him of his great error and mistake, for he will not say that unbelievers Children have any right thereto in their Infancy. Tho' tis evident that Abrahams natural Seed, tho' ungodly persons, were required to Circumcise their Children, and their Children had the same right to it; for were none but godly Jews to circumcise their Male infants? Pray observe this.

2. Besides, did not God expressly command Abraham as well to circumcise his Male Infants as himself; and so his offspring their Children after him in their generations? And now did our Saviour give such a Commission about Gospel Baptism, viz. that first those that believed should be Baptized, and then their Infants; or was there not the same purity of reason for Christs Commission about Baptism to have run thus, as there was for Gods Commission so to run to Abraham about circumcision? If what you say was true but we will come to his reasons to prove our Baptism a counterfeit, and our Churches no Churches of Christ.

In Page 186. first, because, saith he, they disown the Covenant God made with Abraham, in which the very foundation; for Baptism, was laid; let them find another foundation for it, if they can; for that Covenant is founded upon Christ himself, &c.

1. Answer, This in the first place is not true he charges us with, viz. that we disown the Covenant God made with Abraham; for the Covenant of Grace, God promised to him we own, and contend for it as far forth as any

can—But we do say the Covenant of circumcision is disannulled; that we do disown to be in force now.

2. Could he prove that Baptism is founded upon the Covenant made with Abraham, he would seem to say some thing: But we deny that utterly; for had not Christ Instituted or given it forth in the New Testament, none could have known that Baptism had been an Ordinance; it was not Imprinted on the Hearts of Men, but it is a mere positive precept.

3. I will shew you therefore another foundation for it, and not the Covenant God made with Abraham, viz. the great Commission of Jesus Christ, Mat. 28. 18, 19, 20. Mark. 16. 15. If we have it not here, saith Mr. Richard Baxter, where have it we? But you are wiser it appears than that Pedobaptist. Now Friend, since our Baptism is founded on Christs Commission, both as to subject and mode of Baptizing, our Baptism is no counterfeit, and so you will know one day.

2. Your second reason is, because we Baptise the Adult Seed of Believers, then were Baptized in their Infancy, as they ought not.

Answer, You do but beg the question. We 'tis true, do Baptise the Adult Seed of some Believers, but we deny they were Baptized in their Infancy, they were but Rantized; but had they been in their Infancy Baptized, i. e. Dipped, yet not having the prerequisites of Baptism, viz. Faith and Repentance, they were not the true subjects of that Gospel ordinance. But Friend, do we do well to Baptise the off-spring of unbelievers, since by your argument they in their Infancy could not have true right to it, it being intayled on Believers Seed only? is that Branch of our Baptism a counterfeit also?

3. You say their Baptism cannot be good, because they deny it to their own Seed and off-spring; when as the Covenant is made to Believers and their Seed: So that either they are no believers themselves, or else they Reprobate their own Children.

1. Answer,

1. *Answer*, Our Baptism may be good in your own opinion, I suppose, if our parents were unbelievers — But Friend, whose authority renders any Ordinance good? If we act according to the authority of Christ in Baptism, is not our Baptism good? We deny Baptism to our Children, because all are required to believe, repent, &c. before Baptized, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. *Mark* 16. 16, *Act.* 2. 36, 37. *Act.* 8. 12, 14, 35, &c.

But do we reprobate our Children because we Baptise them not? is that in our power? or can Baptism bring into, or cast out of Gods election?

3. Friend, we deny that the Covenant of Grace, God promised to Abraham, gives any a right to Baptism. No, no, 'tis Christs positive command. If the Covenant of Grace gave Lot no right to circumcision, as it did not, because not commanded of him, how can the Covenant of Grace give right to Baptism to any person but to such only that Christ hath commanded to be Baptized?

4. And lastly, you say their Baptism cannot be good, because their Principle is to Baptise Adult Believers, but not their Seed; which is to Baptise, but part of the believer; whereas they should Baptise, not only a part of him, but all of him: So that their Baptism is but a counterfeit Baptism.

Answer, Is this to shew your great wisdom? But are our Children a part of our selves and are we not believers without our Children? How if our Children should prove unbelievers, then I fear we shall not go for compleat believers, but one part of us is a believer, and the other part of us an unbeliever; also then if your Child should perish, but a part of you would be saved; is it fit such stuff should be Printed? Do not mistake your self, you are one compleat Man, and your Son another, and you are no less compleat a Man if you have no Child at all: So if you are a believer you are a compleat believer and want no part, and if your Child is an unbeliever: yet you are not less a compleat believer.

But you that Sprinkle only the Face, I am sure you do not Baptise the whole person of a Child, nor any part of it, nor of the Adult neither: What shall I call your Baptism. —

In Page 187. you quote our three Queries, but answer none of them.

1. Whether Children are in the Covenant of Grace, absolutely or conditionally? 2. Whether that can be an ordinance of Christ for which there is neither precept nor example?

3. Whether in matters of meer positive right, such as Baptism is, we ought not to keep expressly and punctually to the revealed will of the Lawgiver?

Had you answered these three queries to the purpose, you had done, ten times more than what is contained in your whole Book.

But instead of answering you ask this question, viz. where do you find any command for the Infant Seed of believers, to stay till they are Adult, to be Baptized?

1. *Answer*, Where did God expressly forbid Abraham to circumcise his Male Infants, on the 7th or 9th day, or not to circumcise Female Infants?

2. There needs no Negative Law where there is a Law in the affirmative; if on the 8th day, it follows not on the 7th or 9th; if Males only are expressed, not Females; so if believers, if such who are taught and made Disciples by teaching, are commanded to be Baptized, then all must stay till they do believe, and are taught and made Disciples, before Baptized.

3. Was not the Gospel, think you, planted in Joseph and Mary's House, and yet the Holy Child Jesus stayed till he was about 30 years old, before Baptized. Also Gregory Nazianzen in his 4th Oration, saith Dr. Duveil, gives an instance of those who died without Baptism by reason of Infancy.

And the same Nazianzen, saith he, tho' he was a Bishops Son, being a long time bred up under his Father, was not Baptized until he came to Mans age; and so Basil the Great, who was born of pious Parents, and instructed from his Childhood, was not Baptized until a Man.

The like he says of Eusebium, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustin, &c.

Nothing of this nature ought to be done in Gods worship, without authority from his word; prove if you can, one Infant was Baptized from the beginning of Manhood, to the end of the Revelations of John.

Arguments to prove that those Churches who are gathered by Faith and Repentance, and upon the profession of Faith are Baptized (which are called Anabaptists) are true Churches of Christ; which Mr. Shute denies so to be.

1. **A**rgument All those Churches who are right in matter and form are true Churches.

But those Churches, falsely called Anabaptists, are, right in matter and form ergo they are true Churches.

The matter of true Churches are godly persons, or true believers; the true form is the order or constitution of the Gospel Church, viz. The Adult upon the profession of Faith and Repentance, Baptized; and so with joynt consent give themselves up to the Lord, and one to another, to walk in fellowship and communion in all the Ordinances of the Gospel.

2. Arg. Those Churches which consist of godly persons owning all the essentials of the true religion, among whom the word of God is truly preached, and the Sacraments are duly administered, are true Churches of Jesus Christ.

But these Baptized Churches we contend for, falsely called Anabaptists, do consist of godly persons owning all the essentials of the true religion, among whom the word of God is truly preached, and the Sacraments duly and truly administered, ergo they are true Churches of Jesus Christ.

3. Arg. Those Churches that are constituted according to the direct pattern laid down in the New Testament; are true Churches of Jesus Christ.

The Baptized Churches, falsely called Anabaptists, are constituted according to the direct pat-

tern laid down in the New Testament, ergo they are true Churches of Jesus Christ.

To these let me add the fourth, which Mr. Collins hath in his half Sheet.

4. Arg. Those Churches who make Christ's merits the foundation of their Salvation, and his Doctrine the foundation of their Churches constitution, are true Churches; and their Baptism is Authentick: But the Baptists do thus, ergo.

5. Arg. If the ordinances of Christ are to be kept as they were first delivered to the Saints, and as practised by the Apostolical Church, our Baptism, which you call a counterfeit, is Christ's true Baptism.

But the Ordinances of Christ are to be kept as they were first delivered to the Saints, and as they were practised by the Apostolical Church, ergo, our Baptism is Christ's true Baptism.

But Friend, how can you hold Communion with such persons who have a counterfeit Baptism? for I hear you break Bread with some who own no other Water-Baptism but that of Believers only, and deny Infants to be subjects thereof. I think none of our godly Brethren who are Pede-Baptists, ever denied our Baptism, tho' they strive to justify theirs: which of them will call the Baptism of believers, yea, tho' such who were Sprinkled when Babies, to be a counterfeit? Without repentance you must be accountable for this one day.

C H A P. V.

Containing an account of some of Mr. Shute's onseemly, Scoffing and opprobrious language cast upon Mr. Collins, and my self together, with his false and abusive representation of us, and of several places of Holy Scripture; with his Impertinences, Inconsistencies and self-contradictions, as also those abuses he hath cast on the Baptized Congregations, in which Rom. 11. 16. is explained, viz. if the Root be Holy so are the Branches. And if some of the Branches were broken off, &c.

First I shall begin with Mr. Shute's unbecoming and Scoffing expressions as they lie here and there in his Book. 1. Page 5. He intimates we are horribly bigotted to our opinion.

In Page 4. he says he will not render railing for railing. Yet in Pag. 5. you will find these expressions, speaking to Mr. Collins, you have charged me falsely You bogled and juggled with the sacred Scriptures. Yet he has not made either of these things to appear. In the said 5 Page he saith, here thou hast the Cavils of the adversary Answered.

In Page 42. Because Mr. Collins saith, that the habit of Faith if it be in all Infants of believers, it cannot be lost; there being no losing the habits of Grace, &c.

Mr. Shute, says *this Gentleman* (meaning Mr. Collins) doth as little Boyes, that make a thing of Rags in Imitation of a Cock, and when they have set it up throw at it. But gives no other Answer (as appears to me) than by denying that he asserted, all Infants of believers have habitual Faith; yet 'tis from that Topick he seems to plead for the Baptizing of all believers Infants?

In Page 46. he says, Mr. Collins is troubled with a grumbling in his gizzard. Are those comely expressions.

He says in Page 57. that Mr. Collins is pleased to mock at habitual Faith, because he compares Faith Potential and habitual: Faith in the Infants of believers, as such, with Transubstantiation, &c.

He renders me worse then the Devil. 'Page 116. The Devil left out part of a Scripture 'once to tempt our Saviour with; but in my work 'Judgment, saith Mr. Shute, this Author had done 'is three times successively to maintain this error, ' &c. the better to beguile and deceive poor ignorant bigotted Souls, &c.

The Lord knows I did not leave out part of the Text at any time, to avoid answering their objection, or to favour our cause: But quoted then what was to the purpose in Hand: And that objection I designed to answer afterwards, as I did in the second part in order. As the Reader may see that hath the Book.

In Page 82. he saith, speaking of Mr. Collins, was there ever such Legerdemain played with the Sacred Scripture? In Page 23. he speaking to Mr. Collins, cries out, O for shame cease from bringing your Carnal reason, &c. Whereas 'tis he himself that infers false conclusions from Mr. Collins words, and then cries out, O for shame.

Page 24. Where are you now with your humane invented, Lame, Decrepid Salvation, &c. Are not these Unchristian Reflections? Besides, he had no ground given him thus to abuse Mr. Collins, as if his Salvation was lame and decrepid.

In Page 56. he abuses Mr. Darvise, who is dead, who was cleared by several Learned Ministers upon the answer of an Appeal of his Adversaries.

Mr.

Mr. Shutes's abusive and false Representations of us, and false Interpretation of several places of Holy Scripture, and Gods Holy Ordinance of Dipping Believers in the Name, &c.

First, in Page 6 he calls Dipping, *Ducking*, and the like in several other places; as if we had Believers to a *Ducking-stool* when we Baptise them: And again to vilifie that Holy Ordinance, in the same 6 Page, he says *Dipping is more like a punishment of criminals, than the solemnizing of an Ordinance of God: Yet Dipping was generally owned by all Pedo-Baptists formerly, and by many of late.*

In Page 7. he says, *The Jaylor and his House were Baptized the same hour of the Night; whereas the Text only says, he washed their Stripes the same hour of the Night, and was Baptized, he and all his straight way, Acts. 16. 33.* In Page 7. he says, *They were all Baptized in the Jaylor's House; which is a palpable abuse of the Text that they did not go out of his House to a River:*

Yet the Text clearly intimates, *Acts 16. 34.* that after they were Baptized, (he) that is, the Jaylor brought them into his House. Doth not that imply they went out of it? And it might be to a River, as far as he knows.

He also says, *That we read not of one Soul of the Jaylor's House, that did believe before Baptized, besides the Jaylor himself.*

Whereas we read that all *his* House believed as well as himself, and as soon too as we read of the Jaylor's own Faith; so that he may as well say, the Jaylor did not believe himself, before he was Baptized, as so to affirm concerning *his* House. He says, *Page 11. John Baptist Baptized all that came unto him; yet the Text clearly implies, he rejected the Pharisees and Sadducees, bidding them to bring forth Fruits meet for repentance.*

He asserts in *Page 33.* that those little Children our Saviour faith, did believe on him, were little Infants, calling them *Infant Believers,*

He vilifies Mr. Collins for leaving out in his quotations a word in one or two Texts of Scripture, whereas he destroys not the Sense of the Texts by so doing, nor done to favour his own notion, as that in *Isa. 44. 3.* where his Seed, is put for *thy* Seed; and that in *Acts 2. 39.* Nor doth he wrong his Antagonist in the

least, and therefore no cause of complaint.

But palpable 'tis, Mr. Skutes abuses that Text greatly, *Acts 2. 39.* for the promise is to you and to your Children, and to all that are afar off, even so many as the Lord our God shall call.

Now see this Mans exposition of these words in *Page 71.* viz. *'That was to all the Elect Gentiles and their Children; for the promise runs in the same Channel, to the Gentiles and their Children in the Text, without any variation, as it did to the Jews and their Children.'*

Answer. If he had said to the Elect Gentiles and to their Children or off-spring also, that are elected and called, then he had not wronged the Text; for the promise, that is, that of remission of Sin, and of the Holy Ghost, which runs first to the Jews that are called, and to their Children or Off-spring that are called, and so in like manner also unto the Gentiles that are called, and to their Offspring that shall be called, not to the Jews, and their Children as such, *i. e.* whether Effectually called or not; but to no more of the Jews, nor Gentiles themselves, nor their Children but even so many as the Lord our God shall call. Dr. Hammond confessed this Text is to little purpose brought to prove Infant Baptism:

Seeing by Children is meant off-spring, and refers not to Infants as such; It certainly intends no Children of Jews, or Gentiles, but such only who are elected, and called ones.

Besides, this Man hath left out words in several Texts of Scripture quoted by himself in his Book, yet blames his Antagonists for so doing at a strange manner: For because I left out the words *Everlasting Covenant*, he compares me to the Devil. See *Page 116.* in *Page 21.* he quotes *Gen. 17. 9, 10 11.* but (saith he) neither in these three quotations, nor in his whole Book, hath he so much as named that which is the quintessence of the Covenant, &c. namely as *Everlasting Covenant.* The Devil left out our part of a Scripture, &c.

answer,

Answer, I fear he saw but part of my Book ; for 'tis a great untruth which he affirms, viz. that I never named *Everlasting Covenant* ; for I, as you have heard (in this Answer) did not only name it, but answered the argument that is raised from thence, See Part 2. Page 9, 10.

Now that Mr. *Shute* hath left part of the words in some Texts, and added words in other he hath quoted, See Page 120. Where he mentions the words of that Text 1 Cor. 15. 22. *For as in Adam all dye, so in Christ shall all be made alive* ; he has wrote thus for as in Adam all the Elect dye, so in Christ they shall all be made alive ; this is all in the same Italick Letter : Where he adds (Elect) and (they) rendring the sense as if none should have a resurrection but the Elect, which is against the Sense of the Apostle.

So in Page 133. mentioning Mark 16. 16. viz. *He that believeth and is Baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.*

He hath wrote it thus, viz. *He that believeth shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned.*

(Baptized) is left out to favour his design, I fear ; for tho' faith be the same in every age, yet the Ordinances are not the same, under the Gospel, as under the Law, for Baptism is no legal Ordinance, nor the Lords Supper, &c.

Also he has given a false exposition on several Verses, in Rom. 11. and hath in so doing abused Mr. Collins also ; these are Mr. Collins words (as repeated by Mr. *Shute*) Page 74, 76. *The natural Branches are broken off, ergo Childrens visible incovenanting, is repealed ; the Antecedent of this Enthymer is clear from the Apostles assertion, Rom. 11. 19, 20, 21. by the natural Branches without controversie, is to be understood the natural Seed of Abraham.*

Now Mr. *Shute* leaves out Mr. Collins demonstration following, to prove his argument, i. e. by the Branches faith he, without controversie, is to be understood the natural Seed of Abraham ; and the breaking off, must either be meant, from visible Church-membership ; and external privileges thereunto belonging ; or the Everlasting Covenant of grace : It cannot, saith he, be the latter, because that Covenant is immutable, therefore it must be the former. Thus Mr. Collins : And he argues to the purpose, for 'tis impossible for any to be broken off from the Covenant of Grace, who were once in that ; and 'tis as clear that, the Jews

or natural Seed of Abraham, as such, are broken off, from being any more a visible Church, and that the legal Covenant, for their incovenanting, i. e. both Parents and Children, as such, is gone and taken away ; he took away the first that he might establish the Second, Heb. 10. 9.

There is a First, and a Second, an Old and a New. Now the first is only taken away, as a Covenant of works, *do this and thou shalt live* ; and as it was given to the whole House of Israel, by vertue of which they held their Church-State, and Church-membership, and all their external Rites, Ordinances, and Priviledges, for the Priesthood being changed there is made of necessity a change of the whole Law, Heb. 7. 12.

Tho' it was for the Jews unbelief they were broken off, yet the dispensation being changed, it was impossible for them to keep their Church-State and external Legal Rites, and Priviledges any longer ; for 'tis evident that those Jews that believed in Christ, abode no longer members of their Old Church ; but were transplanted into the Gospel-Church ; what can be more clear than this, viz. the Old House and Old legal Right of Church-membership is overturned and rooted out for ever ?

And say I, if the Covenant for incovenanting of the fleshy Seed, as such, is abolished, and no new Law is given forth for the bringing in again professing Parents and their Carnal Seed, as such, what is it this Man contends for, yet what a mighty stie he makes about that in Rom. 11. you may see in Page 76, &c. This Man makes it his main business to prove that the Covenant of Grace is not taken away, which we assert with as much Zeal as he ; but see how he abuses the Text, Rom. 11. 17. viz. *as those Jews which were these Branches were broken off, and their Children wish them were cast out of the Covenant : So the Gentiles, and all their Children were taken into Covenant, in their room, and did partake of the same Priviledges, with those Jews that did abide firm in the Covenant, &c.*

1. Answer, This Man doth not distinguish one Covenant from another, i. e. the Legal from the Gospel Covenant ; nay he owns but one so that he asserts the unbelieving Jews, were broken off of the Covenant of Grace, and their Children too ; by which he seems to plead for Arminianism or final falling out of the Covenant of Grace : Nay worse, i. e. that the Children

Children were broken off from the Covenant of Grace for their Parents Sin and unbelief, which is very, n. sup'd. Mr. *Shute* seems to strain the Metaphor the Apostle makes use of, in *Rom.* 11. beyond what the Holy Ghost intendeth by it; for Metaphors (as we use to say) will not always run on all four.

For if the first Fruit be Holy, the lump is also Holy; and if the Root be Holy, so are the branches, *vers.* 16.

By the Root is doubtless meant Abraham; but then know that Abraham was a twofold Root as well as a twofold Father, viz. the Root of all his natural Seed, and the Root or Father of all his true Spiritual; now for a Man to say that the Apostle here refers to Abraham as a natural Root, and so to his natural or Carnal Seed as such, is to destroy the whole Scope and drift of the Holy Ghost in this Chapter; in the close of the 10 Chapter the Apostle shews the Jews were rejected, and the Gentiles called; and in the beginning of this 11. Chapter he prevents an objection; some might be ready to say if this be so, then God hath cast away his Covenant People. To this he Answers, *vers.* 2. *God hath not cast away his People whom he foreknew.* that is, his Elect or the Spiritual Seed of Abraham that were among the Jews; See *vers.* 5. *even so then at this present time there is a Remnant according to the Election of Grace.* Again, in *vers.* 7 *what then Israel hath not obtained, &c.* (that is the natural Seed as such,) *but the Election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded;* and tho' the main Body of the Jews were rejected for their unbelief, yet in the Latter Days God will call all those and bring them in, who belong to the Election of Grace, and so all Israel, (that is the Spiritual Israel) shall be saved, See *vers.* 15. and 26.

And from hence the 16. verse is brought in, viz. *for if the first Fruit be Holy, the lump is also Holy, &c.*

Is the Apostle speaking here of a Legal Federal Holiness? No, not a word of any such matter: But of such a Holiness as was in the Root, i. e. in Abraham who was Spiritually Holy, being an Elect Person; and to that Holiness the Apostle refers, viz. first in respect of Gods Election, Personal, and inherent in Gods intention.

Now then to apply the Holiness and Infection here, to outward Dispensation only in the visible Church, which is meant of saving Grace in the invisible, and to make every

believing Parent a like Root to his posterity with Abraham to his Seed, as some have done, and this Man seems to do; is a great abuse of the Sacred Text.

For this would be to set up another wall of separation or partition betwixt (believers and their Seed, and unbelievers and their Seed,) as the Old one was, which is now broken down between Jews and Gentiles according to *Eph.* 2. 14, 15. as also a knowing of Men after the Flesh, i. e. after fleshly Descent, external Priviledges, &c.

2. The first Fruit spoken of we understand to refer to Isaac, Jacob, and the Holy Patriarchs, who were given to Abraham as the first Fruit of the Covenant of Grace God made with him, who were all Holy as Abraham, their Root was Holy, that is, Spiritually and Inherently Holy.

3. By the Lump may be meant the whole Body of the Elect or Spiritual Seed of Abraham, who lived from the time the first Fruit was given him until the Gospel Days, who were all Holy as the Root also.

By Lump cannot be intended the whole Nation of the Jews, as Mr. *Shute* positively affirms, in Page 82. for if so, what consistency can there be in the Apostles words and Argument? The Apostle speaks of the Elect Israel, not of the fleshly and Carnal Israel; take this Mans words the first Fruit the Jews, &c. the Lump or whole Nation of them; and here is the same Root, on which the Gentiles are grafted, Page 82. He confounds the first Fruit and Lump together, and says by it is meant the whole Nation of the Jews. What Text can be wronged worse? We grant 'tis the same Root that all Gentile believers partake of the fatness of which the godly Jews partook of under the Law, viz. the Blessings of the Covenant of Grace made with the Root Abraham; but what is this to our Carnal Seed as such?

4. By the Branches who are said to be Holy also, certainly is to be understood those Elect ones of Israel who were living in the Apostles Days, as *vers.* 5. *even so then at this time also there is a Remnant according to the Election of Grace.*

Now observe the Apostle speaks, in *vers.* 17. of some Branches that were broken off, and of the Gentiles who were like a wild Olive Tree, being grafted in; these Branches that were broken off, were the unbelieving Jews, who at that time comprehended the whole national

national Church of *Israel* ; for all that believed that were *Jews*, were transplanted into the Gospel Church, these Branches that were broken off sprang from the same Root as *Abraham*, was their Father according to the *Flesh* and *Legal* Covenant, and for a time seemed true Branches, they were of *Israel*, though not *Israel*, *Rom. c. 6.* they were the Children of the *Flesh*, but not the Children of the promise, they were in the external Covenant, but being not in the Covenant of Grace, by Faith, and the Old Covenant being now gone and taken away, they were cut off and no more lookt upon as Branches in any sense.

They were Branches in the Old Testament Church, but there is a new will made, a new and last Testament confirmed, and ratified by the Death of the Testator *Jesus Christ*, and the fleshly Seed as such have no such Legacy, lest them as in the Old Testament, viz. to be Members of the New Testament Church, that running to none but to such who believe, &c. but they not believing, or for their unbelief were cut or broken off.

1. Not broken off the Covenant of Grace, as Mr. *Shute* intimates, because they never were in that Covenant.

2. Not broken off Gods Election, for to that they did not belong : But,

3ly. They were broken off and their Children as such (or as so considered) so that they are no more a visible Church of God, nor a People in any Covenant relation to him.

Yet we are not to conceive although those unbelieving *Jews* were in this Sense, broken off from their old standing and Church state that their Children who believed were rejected and lost, no, no ; they that did believe in *Christ* and submit to the new dispensation, were by Faith grafted into *Christ*, and upon the profession of their Faith were united also to the Gospel Church and became members thereof.

And so with the believing Gentiles did partake of the fatness of the Covenant of Grace God made with *Abraham*, and of the Blessings and Privileges of the Gospel Church, and doubtless this is the very truth of the matter according to the main Scope and design of the Holy Ghost, in this Chapter : Now then Mr. *Shute* greatly wrongs this place of Sacred Scripture.

1. Whilst he argues that the *Jews* were broken off from the Covenant of Grace.

2. He wrongs the Text, whilst he says

it was no dissolution of the *Jewish Church*, but an excommunication of those unbelieving Persons out of it, by which he intimates as if the *Jewish Church* state still remains, and that the believing Gentiles are grafted into that old *Legal* Church that is removed and gone for ever.

3. He wrongs this Text, whilst he would have all unbelievers Children of the *Jews*, broken off the Covenant of Grace, for to that he seems to refer : For those of them that were in it were not broken off from that Covenant nor could be ; and those of the *Jewish* Children, that believed, were in the like good Estate with believing Gentiles, and their believing Children ; and many of the Children of the unbelieving *Jews* did no doubt own *Jesus Christ*, believe in him, and were implanted into the Gospel Church.

4. Whilst he pleads for believing Gentiles and their Infants, as such, to be taken into the Covenant of Grace, and so made Members of the Church of *Christ* now, as the Children of the *Jews* were Members of the Church, under the Law ; for this he affirms Page 81, 82.

5. Whilst he applies the Holiness and Infection here meant, to outward Dispensation, only in the visible Church, which is meant of saving Grace in the invisible.

6. Whilst he makes every believing Parent a like root to his posterity with *Abraham* to his Seed, he may as well say every believer is a common Father, to all that believe, as *Abraham* was — For both these Conclusions I infer from his notion.

1. Reader, Pray observe, that the *Jews* that believed not, were broken off from being any more the People of God, in any Covenant relation to him, and this was for their unbelief, and their Church State being gone by the Dispensation of the Gospel, and by the bringing in the Gospel Church.

2. That whosoever either *Jews* or Gentiles who are grafted into *Christ* the true Olive, and into the Gospel Church, must believe or be grafted in by Faith, i.e. by their own Faith and own consent, not by the Faith of their Parent be made Members of the Church under the Gospel ; no, but must believe themselves as well as their Parents ; 'tis not enough now to say we have *Abraham* to our Father, or that our Parents were believers, and in Covenant, because the Church now does not consist of the carnal

carnal Seed, but of the true Spiritual Seed only.

Mr. Shute says in Page 82. to Mr. Collins, *if you have not enough you shall have enough, before I have done with you.*

I am satisfied and he too, he has said too much unless it were better or to better purpose.

He appeals to *any experienced Christian among us, or of our party to judge whether there can be a more full Text of Scripture produced, to prove the continuance and Stability of the Covenant, &c.*

If he will take my thoughts (who am 'tis like in his opinion as well as my own an unexperienced Christian) I must tell him he hath mistaken his *Antagonist* and the Text too: Cannot the Jewish Legal Church State go, but the Covenant of Grace must go, with them? *God forbid.*

The Apostle it is evident in this Chapter, *Rom. 11.* speaks of Gods Election, which ran first to *Abrahams* natural Seed, according to the Covenant of Grace, that is, to the Elect among the Jews, and so argues *God had not cast away his People whom he foreknew*; and from hence he shews that all that belong to the said Election of Grace shall be called, and in the latter days be brought in, or grafted into their own true Olive tree, *i. e.* into Christ and into the Gospel Covenant and Church, for all (the true) *Israel* shall be saved, as it is written, *&c.* 'tis said they are Holy that is they are decreatively and in Gods sight and intention Holy: I wonder at some Expositors who conclude, that it is an external relative Federal Holiness the Apostle speaks of here, which Holiness is not mentioned in all the New Testament, as an eminent Writer observes.

And this brings me to what Mr. Shute says, to that Text *1 Cor. 7. 14. Else were your Children unclean, but now are they Holy*: Which Scripture he mistakes also whilst he asserts it is Federal Holiness, as well as Matrimonial Holiness, for no doubt the Sanctification of the unbelieving Husband to the believing Wife, is the same Sanctification or Holiness that is said to be in the Children, that is, the Husband and Wife were Sanctified, or set apart for the use of one another, by Gods ordinance of Marriage, and so their Children were Holy, *i. e.* Legitimate, lawfully begotten, and not Bastards; for no doubt their Children that were born when both were unbelievers, were Holy in the sense the

Apostle speaks of, as such that were born when one was a believer: But see a full answer to this Text in *Restor Rectified*, from Page 113. to Page 120.

And when he writes again let him answer what is there said. Mr. Shute also gives a false exposition of that Text, *Rom. 6. 3, 4. Page 15, 16.* Whilst he refers there to the Baptism of suffering, telling us the Apostle was there exercising the Saints, to prepare for sufferings; which is not true.

Likewise he abuses that Text, *1 Cor. 2. But God hath chosen the weak things of the World, &c.* by intimating as if the Apostle means little Children, and *who are weaker* (saith he) *than Children?* Page 23.

Also that in *Psa. 82.* I think he would have to refer to Infants, *i. e.* out of the Mouths of *Babes and Sucklings* thou hast perfected thy praise, Page 23.

In Page 130. that in *Mark 16. 16. Job. 3. 3.* he applies to Infants, viz. *he that believes and is Baptized shall be saved, but he that believes not shall be damned.* And so pleads for like necessity, for infants to believe if saved, as the Adult.

In Page 10. he seems to infer that John Baptist Baptized little Infants, because 'tis said, *there went out to meet him all Judea and Jerusalem, and all the regions round about Jordan, and were Baptized.*

Which I have answered, *As laid to the Root*; in my reply to Mr. Exell, see 2 Part Page 35. to 54.

In Page 174. Mr. Shute citing *Rom. 11. 6. if it be by Grace then it is no more of Works*; he infers if dying Infants are saved without Faith then they must be saved by works.

Which is an abuse of that Text; for as the Apostle speaks not of Infants, so he speaks of Gods Grace and Favour, in opposition to works or merits, according to that in *Eph. 2. 8. by Grace you are saved*; he puts Faith in the place of Grace: We say no Infant can be saved but by Grace; yet we do say we see not how it can be said that Infants do or can believe.

And now let me infer from ~~his~~ notion, viz. if Infants cannot believe, they must all perish and be damned, this follows clearly from what he asserts: He had need to see he is certain of what he affirms.

In Page 92. (he says), *it is common for Men of our opinion to bring in, and set up our own Carnal Reason, in opposition to the Wisdom of God*; is not this an Unchristian charge? Besides, he proves not what he says, nor attempts to do it.

Sure

Sure some gracious Person or Persons he is concerned more particularly with in Church-fellowship, will look upon themselves bound in duty to inquire into some of these grand enormities, false accusations, and other evils this Man is found guilty of in his Writings.

In Page 13. he says, *that part of the Man, Woman, or Child, that is Baptized, must be naked; and if the whole Body must be Baptized, then the whole Body must be all naked also.*

And he quotes a passage of Mr. Baxter; as if Mr. Tombs could, or did Baptise Women naked, to render such a practice odious as indeed it would be, should any do it; but to cast that on us, is Unchristianly done. In Page 19. he intimates as if we had found two ways to Salvation, because we know not that dying Infants have Faith, or can believe.

In Page 20. he abuses Mr. Collins, as if he was ignorant of any such thing as habitual Faith, because he knows nothing of such habits in Infants, and says he derides habitual Faith, which is a notorious falsehood, and that which Mr. Collins abhors to do.

In Page 20. he would have his Reader think that Mr. Collins had rendred Mr. Charnock an Anabaptist, because he quoted him to detect his notion of habitual Faith in Infants.

In Page 43. because Mr. Collins said unless Children have personal actual Faith, they are not to meddle with Gods most holy things, Mr. Shute says, *by this mans opinion Elect dying Infants must be lost and damned*; he would have those Children to be Infants that *cried Hosanna to the Son of David*;

For if it be not that he means it is nothing to his purpose; for we deny not, but some little Children have and may have a work of God upon their Hearts, tho' not above five or six years old.

In Page 68. he infers four false Conclusions upon Mr. Collins, denying Faith to be in Infants.

1. *That God cannot work Faith in young Infants, because they are not able to help him, &c.*

Doth Mr. Collins question Gods power, or intimate God cannot work, without help of the Creature?

2. *That he doth tacitly declare that God is not able to make them capable of the Reception of Grace.* Because they are not of years to exercise it, as if Mr. Collins did not know God was infinite in power.

3. *That Adult persons do qualifie themselves*

for the reception of Grace; or at leastwise are Co-partners with the Spirit of Grace, in the working of it.

4. *If this be so, saith he, then it is not Gods Grace, but Mans work, &c.*

Which are all false Conclusions and great abuses cast on Mr. Collins, and no ways to be inferred from his positions.

In Page 73. he renders the Baptists to be cunning deceivers, take his words, *i. e. I am not, saith he, all together ignorant of their devices, and stratagems by which they uphold their opinion, in which their Principles are enveloped and lie Dormant.*

In Page 115. he says, *Benjamin Reach doth reckon Abraham of greater antiquity than Christ.*

Answer, This is a false charge likewise, and no such consequence can be gathered from my words, to which he refers, as my Answer shews in this reply.

In Page 126. he saith, *this Author is for the saving Elect Dying Infants by some other Covenant, and not by the Covenant of Grace.*

Answer, This is also false and a great abuse, for I no where hint any such thing, but say, 'tis impossible any Infant or Adult Person either should be saved by any other Covenant but that tho' I say they may be saved and not be Members of the visible Church; as some Infants were before God made known, the Covenant of circumcision and set up the legal Church of Israel.

In Page 134. he calls our Doctrine a fallacious Doctrine; and knows not which to wonder at most, viz. our boldness and confidence: Or our Peoples ignorance to be so horribly deluded and imposed upon. What Enemy could reproach us worse?

In Page 113. saith he, *Thus I have given you one broad side more, by which I have brought your opinion by the Lee, and all the Carpenters and Calkers in the Nation cannot save it from sinking.*

Answer, Friend you mistake our cause, and opinion is as firm and as sound as ever, and needs no Carpenters nor Calkers to mend those Breaches you have made.

In Page 140. he says, *Thus you see the Covenant God made with Abraham, and all his Seed both Spiritual and Carnal, stands fast and firm to Gospel Believers, and all their Seed both Spiritual and Carnal; notwithstanding Hercules with his Club and Benjamin bowed it with his broad Ax, they cannot destroy it, because it is an everlasting Covenant.*

1. Answer, Are these Savoury expressions? my Ax Friend, is Gods word; the Title of that Book was the words of the Text, viz. the Ax laid at the Root, and this Ax will cut down all your Thorns and Briars, do what you can.

2. How he hath proved that Covenant God made with Abraham, and his Carnal Seed as such, doth remain, let the Reader now Judge.

3. How came (if this be so) Abraham's natural Seed to be uncircumcised as he himself con-

fesses in, Page 37. nay that they unchurched themselves. In his Postscript, Page 190. he says, *tho' he has thus written concerning the Anabaptists, and proved their Congregations to be no Churches, and their Baptism to be a counterfeits, and their Opinion Sacrilegious, in that they Rob the Church of her treasure, &c.* — These are very hard words, and also false; for he has not done what he says, and never will, nor can he do it.

An Account of some of Mr. Shute's Imperinences, Inconsistences and Self-contradictions.

IN the last place take a few of his Imperinences, &c. In Page 49. If you can prove, saith he, by plain Scripture Testimony that ever Christ or any of his Apostles, &c. did forbid the Baptizing the Infant Seed of Believers, &c.

Answer, Now how impertinent is this? Where did Christ forbid Infants of Believers, the Lords Supper? and indeed they may have that as well as Baptism, and the first Fathers that established Infant Baptism, gave them the Lords Supper also:

2. Where is *crossing* in Baptism forbid, or *Popish Salt Spiule*, or *Crisom* or other *Popish rites*? These in plain words are not forbid, are they therefore lawful? If Christ would have them to be Baptized, it would have been expressed in the affirmative; and is this horribly to impose our own uncouth notions as you affirm in the said 49. Page of your Book?

Where hath Christ forbid Baptizing of *Turks*, and *Infidels*, or the Children of unbelievers?

In Page 98. he says the Church of the Jews was not a legal Church, take his words, viz. *the Church of God under the Mosaisk Law was not a Carnal legal Church.* Strange contradiction! What a Church under the Law and not a legal Church? he may as well say the Church of God under the Gospel, is not a Gospel Church.

In Page 97. he distinguishes not on the Covenant made with Abraham, but positively asserts that off from that Covenant God made with Abraham, viz. The Covenant of Grace, some of the natural Branches were broken;

yet in contradiction to this he shews, in Page 74. from *Psa. 89.* That the Covenant of Grace is firm and abideth for ever, and else where shews that there's no final falling from grace; all those therefore say I, that are in that Covenant cannot fail of Salvation; therefore those Branches never were in the Covenant of Grace.

In Page 25. he says, *God saves Elect dying Infants in no ways or means differing in any one point or part from that wherein he saves Adult believers.* Yet in Page 65. he owns *Infants cannot exercise grace in an ordinary way, and that nothing is required of them personally but passive Obedience.* Is nothing required say I, of Adult believers but passive Obedience? If there is then the way or mode of Gods saving dying Infants differs in some part or point from the way or means of saving the Adult; and clear it is that more than passive obedience is required of Adult persons.

One while he says all *Abrahams Seed* are in the Covenant of Grace God made with him, and he denies final falling out of that Covenant, yet in Page 12. he says, *one of Abrahams Sons or Seed is praying to him in Hell: And so be Abrahams Seed will not serve their turn.*

He is for a Congregational Church, and yet in Page 34. Speaking of the Gospel Church, he says, *all the Seed of believers are Members as much now as the Jewish Children were under the Law.* And that it is the same Church State, tho' in another dress, and denies the dissolution of the Jewish Church, Page 35.

Can a natural Church consisting of whole Parishes, Families, and Provinces, be all one with Gospel Congregational Churches of believers only?

Why did this Man leave the Church of England? also then the Jewish Church-state by his opinion continues still: He may say the invisible Church is the same now as then; but not the visible, the matter, as well as the form is changed, —*Ye also as living Stones are built up a Spiritual House*, &c. 1 Pet. 2. 5.

Was not the Gospel Church gathered out of the Jewish and Heathenish Nations, consisting only of such Men and Women who made a profession of their Faith? let him prove any one Infant was ever received into the Gospel Church if he can.

In Page 167. he inquires whether a Farmer destroys his Barn or burns the Floor, when he takes a great heap of Corn and Chaff and Winnows the Corn, and Fans away the Chaff, &c.

Answer, I ask whether or no Christ did not remove by the Gospel Dispensation, all the Wheat out of the old Barn, nay, and pull down that Barn, viz. the Jewish Church, and Fan quit away the Carnal Seed as such, and all the Chaff: And erect a new Garner or Gospel Church, into which he put his Wheat, i. e. Believing Men and Women, whether Jews or Gentiles.

In Page 136. he intimates that the essential part of circumcision is Baptism, and that the essential part thereof remaineth in the Flesh still.

Answer, Then say I, circumcision could not be circumcision without Baptism, nor Baptism be Baptism without circumcision, which is such a piece of Stuff and Impertinences as I never met with all; can a thing be where the Essence or the Essential Part of it is wanting?

In Page 130. he intimates, because I deny Infants to have right to Baptism (or that they

can believe) that I assert two ways to be saved.

He also there says, viz. there is no saving any Person old or young without the Grace of Faith; he Cites Mark 16. 16. Job. 3. 16. Thus you see, saith he, there is but one way to Eternal Life, either for old or young, that is, through Faith in the righteousness and merits of Christ. Wo be to poor Infants then say I, if they cannot believe as the Adult do; if it be thus, we say theres no way to be saved, but by Christ's merits and righteousness imputed, and that Infants must be sanctified that are saved also; but yet we dare not say they do or can be said, to believe as the Adult, and if they do not they must be damned according to his notion because that is true of all the Adult that believe not.

One while he seems to say that the Infants of believers as such, have habitual Faith.

At another time confesses he cannot prove, that this or that Infant of believers hath Faith, or the habit of it, without he had a new Bible, Page 45.

Doubtless the Tree is known by the Fruit if we speak of the Adult, we may know who do believe; (though I deny not but we may be mistaken in some;) how did Paul know that the Saints at Thessalonica were Elected, 1 Thes. 1. 4, 5. Knowing, beloved, your Election of God. He shews how he came to know they had true Faith, and were Elected, for our Gospel came not to you in Word only, but in power, &c. Mr. Shue lays in Page 1.90. that the Anabaptists Congregations be hath proved no Churches; and their Baptism to be a counterfeit, and their opinion Sacrilegious. Yet he hath Communion at the Lords Table with some of them who have this counterfeit Baptism, and deny Infants to be the Subjects of that Ordinance, and Sprinkling to be Baptizing and so are guilty of like Sacrilege with us, there being divers Baptists in that Church to whom he belongs.

A N
A P P E N D I X;
B E I N G

A Reply to Mr. Shute's last single Sheet, in Answer to Mr. Collins's half Sheet; wherein the Covenant of Circumcision, &c. and free Promise of Grace, God made to Abraham, are further and distinctly opened; shewing how they differ from each other.

Since I wrote this reply to Mr. Shute's last Book, I have met with a single Sheet, which he calls an *Answer to Mr. Hercules Collins last Shift*, &c.

Which discovers more of his bitter Spirit, and what ill Influences he is under, — I thought it not amiss to make some remarks upon this Sheet, tho' I suppose Mr. Collins will think himself concerned to vindicate his innocence, from his undue, Unchristian, and false charges: This Paper of Mr. Shute's manifesteth very great confidence touching his notions of the Covenant God made with

Abraham, and as much ignorance: As will quickly appear to all discerning Men who shall read it.

In Page 1st he says, *I have cleared and vindicated the aforesaid Antidote from that foul Aspersions, and totally confuted all the Aspersors in my last Book, in the Judgment of all wise Judicious and Impartial Persons that have read it.*

Answer, Let those wise persons he speak of, first read this precedent answer to his Book and then let them impartially Judge of it.

In Page 2. he speaks of Mr. Collins his five Arguments to prove the Covenant of peculiarity God made with Abraham. To

To this Mr. Shute says, ' *pray where do you find this distinction concerning the everlasting Covenant God made with Abraham, and his Seed?*

Answer, You shall see Friend that there is such a distinction found in the Scripture, and that your reverend Ministers confirm the same thing, viz. That God made a Covenant with *Abram's* natural Seed as such, which is removed; and also a Covenant with *Abram's* Spiritual Seed as such, which runs to Christ, and all that are his elect ones (See Gal. 3. 16. *Now to Abraham and his Seed were the promises made. He saith not, and to Seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy Seed, which is Christ.*

Compared with verse 29. *and if ye be Christs, then are ye Abram's Seed, and heirs according to the promise.*

Now Friend, if you say this promise which the Apostle speaks of, (which is the everlasting Covenant of Grace, God made with *Abram*) was made with many, i. e. both with *Abram's* natural and Spiritual Seed as such, you contradict the Holy Ghost. Paul says, *And not to Seeds as of many, But you say to Seeds, i. e. all his natural and Spiritual Seed, Page 5. See also Rom. 9. 5, 6, 7, 8.*

They are not all Israel, which are of Israel: Neither because they are the Seed of Abram, are they all Children: But in Isaac shall thy Seed be called. That is, they which are the Children of the Flesh, these are not the Children of God: But the Children of the promise (Mark it) are accounted for the Seed. Is not that distinction Mr. Collins speaks of, clearly laid down in these Scripture? doth not the Apostle exclude the Carnal Seed of Abram as such; from being included in the Covenant of Grace?

2. I need not go about to prove, there was a Covenant made with *Abram* and all his natural Seed as such, since that is so clearly and fully spoken of in the Scripture; viz. *That the whole House of Israel both Parents and Children, were taken into the legal Covenant and all were Members of the Jewish Church; read Gen. 17. 9, 10, 12, Dent. 29. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13. But that legal Covenant we affirm is abrogated and taken away: If it were not so, what is it which our Apostle speaks in Heb. 20. 9. He took away the first, that he might establish the Second. Compared with Heb. 8. 7, 8, 13.*

Sure none can once Imagin that this Covenant was the Covenant of Grace: Also what doth the Apostle mean when he says, *cast out the Bond Woman and her Son, Gal. 4. 30. Doth*

he not tell us by the Bondwoman is meant the Old Covenant given to the whole House of Israel, or the lineal Seed of Abram; not the Covenant given to all Mankind in the first Adam; and doth he not tell us by the Son of the Bondwoman is meant the fleshly Seed of Abram as such? Who were all taken into Covenant with God under the Old Testament: And yet is there no Covenant that peculiarly was made with Abram's natural Seed, as such.

In Page 7. Mr. Shute repeats, *Gen. 17. 7. And I will establish my Covenant between me and thee, and thy Seed after thee in their Generations for an everlasting Covenant, to be a God to thee and to thy Seed after thee.*

Here he leaves out the following verse, wherein the Covenant is Mentioned (which he charges as an high crime in others) viz. *this is my Covenant, which ye shall keep between me, and you, and thy Seed after thee; every Man-child among you shall be circumcised. Verse 10. and ye shall circumcise the Flesh of your Fore-skin, and it shall be a token of the Covenant betwixt me and you, verse 11.*

He that is born in thy House, and he that is bought with thy Money, must needs be circumcised: And my Covenant shall be in your flesh; for an everlasting Covenant, verse 13. these Verses he Cites not.

Now Mr. Shute Judges this Covenant is the Covenant of Grace made with *Abram*, and that for two reasons (as I suppose.)

1. Because 'tis called an everlasting Covenant.

2. Because God promised in this Covenant to be the God of *Abram*, and the God of his Seed after him in their Generations, which no doubt refers to his natural Seed as such. Taking in both those of his off-spring that did believe in Christ to come, and such also that did not so believe that proceeded from *Abram's* Loins by *Isaac*.

1. As to the Term *everlasting*, I have shewed in the precedent, Answer, that some times in the Scripture it is taken with restriction, and denotes only a long period of Time, viz. during that Dispensation, or until the *Messias* should come; the Priesthood of *Aaron* is upon the same account called an *everlasting Priesthood*.

Indeed this Covenant could continue no longer than the Token of it abode or was to abide in their Flesh: Read the words again, *verse 13. and my Covenant shall be in your Flesh for an everlasting Covenant.*

2. Circumcision being as our Adversaries say, the Seal of the Covenant, now, say I, since the Seal, namely Circumcision, is broken off and gone, as it was in at the death of Christ: I ask what is become of that Covenant it was a Sign or Seal of, is not the Covenant gone and dissolved, when 'tis cancelled? Besides, read your Annotators on Gen. 17. 13. 'And for the Sign of it, say they, it is so called, because it was to endure through all Generations till the coming of the Messiah, the word *Olim* here and elsewhere rendered everlasting or for ever, being so used to express not only simple Eternity, but any long continuance for many ages, yea some time for a Mans Life, Exod. 21. 6. Deut. 15. 17. 1 King 9. 3. thus Mr. Pools Annotations,

This being so, to what purpose do you make such a stir about the word *Everlasting*?

2ly. As to this second reason, viz. God in that Covenant gave himself to Abraham to be his God, and the God of his Seed in their Generations.

1. Answer, I would know whether God is now in Covenant with Abrahams natural Seed as such; or are they not rejected? how then could this be the unchangeable Covenant of Grace?

Read my 14. Arguments in the precedent Answer, to prove the Covenant of circumcision was not the Covenant of Grace.

2. Was God the God of all Abrahams Carnal Seed as such; by way of special interest? if so, they shall no doubt be all Eternally saved; as well as all the Children or Carnal Seed of Believers: Which you will not admit of.

Therefore consider that God may be said to be the God of a People, two manner of ways.

1. By the free promise or Covenant of Grace, in a Spiritual Sense: Or by Divine Union with him, through faith and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit; 'tis this gives special interest in God to all Adult Persons, and thus he was not the God of all Abrahams Carnal Seed, no, but of a few of them only comparatively, for tho' the number of the Children of Israel be as the Sands of the Sea, yet but a Remnant shall be saved.

2. God may be said to be the God of a People, by entering into an external, outward or legal Covenant with them; and thus he was the God of Abraham, and of all his Carnal Seed or Off-spring, or whole House of Israel: Under the Old Covenant, or Dispen-

sation of the Law: God made them as a Nation, a peculiar People unto himself, and was said to be married to them.

See Dr. Baies one of your own Ministers in his Sermon preached at Mr. Saxters Funeral.

1. He shews that God is the God of all Mankind by Creation.

2. God is the God of a People, upon the account of external calling and profession; and thus, saith he, the posterity of Seth, are so called; and the intire nation of the Jews &c.

Friend, This I desire you to weigh well, for God was not by way of special interest, in a Spiritual Sense the God of Abrahams Carnal Seed as such: Therefore it was this external Covenant, no doubt that Mr. Cotton intends when he says the Ministry of John the Baptist did burn as an Oven, and left the Jews neither the Root of Abrahams Covenant, nor the Branches of their own good works, Cotton on the Covenant Page 21, 22. Friend, you speak as if your Ministers had distilled those notions of yours into you, about the Covenant God made with Abraham; I am satisfied you abuse your Ministers; I am sure Dr. Owen taught you no such Doctrine, as I have already shewed; and I shall here again faithfully cite two or three passages more of that Reverend Minister of Christ: See his Exposition on the 8th Chapter to the Hebrews, Page 219, &c.

1. He shews that the Covenant God made with the whole House of Israel, was not that Ministration of the Covenant of Works God made with all Men in the first Adam.

2. That it was not the Covenant of Grace;

1. Saith he, Page 224. 'the Old Covenant, the Original Covenant of works made with Adam and all Mankind in him is not intended, for this is undoubtedly a Covenant different in the Essence and Substance of it from the New. In Page 219. He saith, but it is evident that the Covenant intended, was a Covenant wherein the Church of Israel walked with God, until such time as this better Covenant was solemnly introduced, 'this is plainly declared in the ensuing context, he says, 'it was become old and ready to disappear. Wherefore it is not the Covenant of works made with Adam, that is intended when this other is said, to be a better Covenant: Thus the Doctor.

Friend

Friend doth not he hereby clearly lay down a Covenant of peculiarity made with *Abrahams* natural Seed as such, or a Covenant that only and peculiarly belonged to them; and 'tis as plain this began in that Covenant God made with *Abraham*.

' In Page 288. he saith, we must grant two distinct Covenants to be intended rather than a twofold Administration of the same Covenant merely to be intended.

He also shews that the old Covenant which God made with the natural Seed of *Abraham* could not be the Covenant of Grace, because there was no reconciliation with God, nor Salvation to be obtained by virtue of that Covenant.

Observe the *Doctor* speaks not of *Adams* Covenant, but of that Covenant God gave to the whole House of *Israel*, or natural Seed of *Abraham*.

He further shews that the Covenant of Grace, untill *Christ* came, was only contained in promise, by which Covenant, all that lived under the Old Testament who had Faith in it were saved, to *Abraham* and his Seed was the promise made, *Gal. 3. 16*. That was the Covenant of Grace, therefore say we, the Covenant of *circumcision*, and *Sinai* Covenant where there was mutual stipulation betwixt God and the whole House of *Israel*, could not be the Covenant of Grace; besides, 'tis said that *that* Covenant they broke, and by so doing, lost all the external blessings of it, as the Prophet *Zach. Chap. 11. 10, 14*. shws, because of the Jews unbelief, and putting the *Messiah* to Death, God broke his Covenant with that People.

Zech. 11. 10. And I took my Staff, even beauty, and cut it asunder: That I might break my Covenant which I made with all the People. What is become now of your everlasting Covenant, God made with all the People of *Israel* or natural Seed of *Abraham*? Is it not gone, are his Carnal Seed as such still in Covenant with God, or are they not with their external legal Covenant cast out? Sir the everlasting Covenant of Grace, that stands firm 'tis true, that is confirmed by the Oath of God, and Blood of *Christ*; but the Covenant in which was contained *circumcision*, and all the Legal Rites and Jewish Church, and Church-membership is gone and taken away.

The New Covenant is not according to that Old Covenant God made with the whole House

of *Israel* or Carnal Seed of *Abraham*; if it be not according to it, then it was not the same in Essence, nature or quality: See *Fir. 31, 32*.

' 1. This, saith the *Doctor*, is the nature and substance of that Covenant, which God made with that People (*viz.*) a peculiar temporary Covenant, &c. Page 235. Mark it Reader.

' He adds and concurs with the *Lutherans*, who deny that by the two Covenants is meant only a twofold Administration of the same Covenant, but that two Covenants, substantially distinct are intended.

' 1. Because in the Scripture they are often so called, and compared with one another, and some times opposed to one another; the first and the last, the new and the old.

' 2. Because the Covenant of Grace in *Christ* is eternal, immutable, always the same, obnoxious unto no alteration, no change or abrogation, neither can these things be spoken of it with respect unto any Administration of it, as they are spoken of the Old: Page 226, 227.

' 1. He shews again that by the Old Covenant is not intended the Covenant of Works made with *Adam* Page 227. When,

' 2. We speak of the New Covenant, saith he, we do not intend the Covenant of Grace absolutely, as though that were not in being and efficacy before the Introduction of that which is promised in this place: For it was always the same as to the substance of it. From the beginning it passed through the whole Dispensation of times, before the Law and under the Law, of the same nature and Efficacy unalterable everlasting, ordered in all things and sure. — Again he saith, when God renewed the promise of it to *Abraham*, he is said to make a Covenant with him, and he did so, but it was with respect unto other things (Mark it) especially the proceedings of the promised Seed from his Loins; but absolutely under the Old Testament it consisted only in a promise: And as such only is proposed in the Scripture. Page 227. it appears that the *Doctor* understands the Covenant God made with *Abraham*, as we do *viz.* the promise to *Abrahams* Seed, *viz.* *Christ* and all Eternal blessings with him, to intend the Covenant of Grace; but whereas it is said God made a Covenant with *Abraham*, &c. that has respect to other things, that which concerned

his natural Seed and out of whose Loins Christ was to come, *That's the Covenant of peculiarity*; he proceeds and gives three reasons why the Covenant of Grace could not absolutely in it self, but in the promise of it only be called a formal) Covenant : Page 227.

1. Because it wanted its solemn confirmation and establishment by the Blood of the only Sacrifice, which belonged unto it; before this was done in the Death of Christ, it had not the formal nature of a Covenant, &c.

2. This was wanting, (saith he) it was not the Spring, rule and measure of all the worship of the Church; this doth belong unto every Covenant, properly so called, that God makes with the Church; that is the intire rule of all the worship that God requires of it, which is that they are to retriplate in their entrance into Covenant with God; but so the Covenant of Grace was not under the Old Testament, for God did require of the Church many duties of worship, that did not belong thereunto; but now under the New Testament this Covenant, with its own Seals and appointments is the only rule and measure of all acceptable worship, wherefore the new Covenant promised in the Scripture and here opposed unto the old, is not the promise of Grace, Mercy, and Life, and Salvation by Christ, absolutely considered, but as it had the formal nature of a Covenant given unto it in its establishment by the Death of Christ, &c.

Page 227.

1. Now pray observe, does not the Doctor clearly hint thereby, that no Rite, Sign, or Seal properly of the Old Testament can be a Rite Sign or Seal properly of the New Covenant, how then could circumcision be the Seal of the said Covenant of Grace?

2. It is evident in the Covenant of circumcision, there was a retriplate at their entrance into that Covenant with God, so that that was a formal Covenant, but the Covenant of Grace, he tells us was no formal Covenant; but only a free promise under the old Testament.

Therefore there was two Covenants held forth in Gods Transactions with Abraham.

First a formal Covenant made with him and all his Fleishly Seed, of which circumcision was a Sign at their entrance into it, which they thereby subscribed unto.

Secondly, The Covenant of Grace held forth only in Gods free promise to him.

3. Whilst the Church enjoyed all the spiritual benefits of the promise (saith he) wherein the substance of the Covenant of Grace was contained, before it was confirmed and made the sole Rule of Worship, unto the Church, it was not inconsistent with the Holiness and Wisdom of God, to bring any other Covenant (Mark it) or prescribe unto it forms of Worship he pleased: Page 228.

Then he proceeds further.

1. That this Covenant did not (saith he) disannul or make in effectual the promise, but that it doth still continue the only means of Life and Salvation, and that this was so our Apostle proves at large, Gal. 3. 17, 18, 189.

2. That this other Covenant with all the worship contained in it, or required, by it, did but direct and lead unto the future establishment of the promise, in the solemnity of a Covenant, &c.

By these words and in other places he shews, that, that Covenant God made with Abrahams natural Seed or whole House of Israel, tho' it was not the Covenant of Grace; Yet it was given in subserviency unto the Gospel Covenant.

3. These things being observed, (saith he,) we may consider that the Scripture doth plainly and expressly make mention of two Testaments, or Covenants, and distinguishes between them in such a way, as what is spoken cannot hereby be accommodated unto a twofold Administration of the same Covenant; The one is mentioned Exod. 20. Deus 3. namely the Covenant God made with the People of Israel, &c. The other promised Jer. 31. 31. Cap. 32. 40. Which is the new Gospel Covenant as before explained: And these two Covenants or Testaments are compared with the other, 2 Cor. 3. 6, 7, 8, 9, Gal. 4. 24, 25. Heb. 7. 22. Chap. 9. 15, 16, 17, 18. Page 228.

These things being, so it follows that the Doctor utterly overthrows, what Mr. John Flavel and other *Pedo Baptists* assert about the Covenant made with the People of Israel at Sinai, to which circumcision appertained, viz. that it was only Administration of the Covenant of Grace, and not a distinct Covenant.

1. The Doctor then proceeds in Page 229. to prove that the Covenant made with *Israel* according to the *Flesh*, did not abrogate the Covenant of Works God made with *Adam*, and substitute that in the room of it.

2. But that it revived, declared, and expressed all the Commands of that Covenant in the *Decalogue*, that being nothing but a Divine Summary of the Law written in the Heart. — Says he.

3. It revived the Sanction of the first Covenant in the curse or sentence of Death which it denounced against all transgressors, Death was the penalty of the transgression of the Covenant of works.

So say I, was Death, the penalty of the transgression of the Covenant of circumcision; the Male-Child the *Flesh* of whose Fore-skin is not cut off, shall dye the Death; which clearly shews it was of the same nature of the *Sinai* Covenant.

4. It revived the promise, saith he, of that Covenant of Eternal Life, upon perfect obedience, *Rom. 10. 5.*

So say I, did the Covenant of circumcision, in that he that was circumcised was bound to keep the whole Law *Gal 5. 3.*

Now, saith the Doctor, this is no other but the Covenant of Works revived; nor had this Covenant of *Sinai* any such promise of Eternal Life annexed to it as such, but only the promise inseparable from the Covenant of works which is revived, saying, *do this and live.*

Hence, saith he, when our Apostle disputeth against justification by the Law, or by the Works of the Law, he doth not intend the Works peculiar, unto the Covenant of *Sinai*; such as were the Rites and Ceremonies of the Worship then instituted, but he intends also the Works of the first Covenant, &c.

Let this be well considered, for 'tis from hence *Paul* excludes circumcision, *Rom. 4.* As being a work or duty opposed to Faith, and so appertaining to the Old Covenant.

He then proceeds in sixteen particulars to prove that the two Covenants differ from each other, Page 226, 237, &c.

1. That they differ in circumstance.

2. That they differ in the circumstance of place, *Gal 4. 24, 25.*

3. That they differ in the manner of their promulgation,

4. In their Mediators,

5. That they differ in their subject matter, both as unto the Precepts and Promises, all sin forbid upon pain of Death, and gave Promise of Life upon perfect Obedience, no promise of Grace to Communicate Spiritual strength to assist in Obedience. — Had, Promises of temporal things in the Land of *Canaan*, in the New Covenant, saith he, all things otherwise.

6. That they differ in the manner of their Dedication and Sanction, that they differ in their substance and end, the old Covenant was Typical, Shadowy & removable, *Heb. 10. 1.*

That they differ in their extent of their Administration, the first was confined unto the posterity of *Abraham* according to the *Flesh*, &c. excluding all others from the participation of the benefits of it.

But the Administration of the New Covenant is extended unto all Nations under Heaven.

That they differ in their Efficacy, the Old made nothing perfect, the first Covenant saith he, became a special Covenant unto that People, that People were the posterity of *Abraham*, Page 232.

Sir, What think you now of two Covenants, and of a Covenant of peculiarity with *Abraham's* Carnal Seed? You must consult your Ministers better before you write again. I doubt not but your Pastor is of Dr. *Owens* Judgment in this matter.

In Page 5. you say, In my last Book I have clearly made out, that whatsoever the Covenants God made with *Abraham*, was to himself and Seed both Spiritual and Carnal that were in the Covenant, is the same now to believers and all their Seed, &c.

1. Answer, Then it follows, that *Abraham's* Carnal Seed who were ungodly Persons, were in the Covenant of Grace; for circumcision belonged to them and their Male Children as far forth as it did appertain, to believers and their Male Children who were of his race.

2. It will follow then also, that we Gentiles that believe, and our natural Off-spring have the same Right to the Land of *Canaan*, and all other Privileges of the Jewish Church with *Abraham's* Carnal Seed. There is no ways to save your self from the greatest absurdities imaginable, without distinguishing between those two Covenants and the two Seeds, or between the Covenant of circumcision made with *Abraham*, &c. and the promise

mise of the Covenant of Grace made to him, and to all his Spiritual Seed as such.

3ly That Christ should come out of *Abrahams Loins* according to the Flesh, and of none else was in that Covenant God made with him, and a special part it was, of the Covenant of circumcision, and was that made to the Gentiles that believe, or was it not peculiar to *Abrahams Seed* only according to the Flesh.

4. Also when the Apostle speaks of the Gospel which God preached to *Abraham*, or promise of the Covenant of Grace; he doth not mention the Covenant of reſtipulation in *Gen. 17. 7, 8, 9.* But that in *Gen. 12. 3.* Chap. 18. and Chap. 22. 8.

In thy Seed shall all Nations be Bless'd: Mark it well.

You say, 'The Covenant God made with *Abraham* and his Seed was never Repealed, nor Dissolved, nor their Church State taken up by the Roots at the coming in of the Gospel; for if it had, say you, how could the Blessing of *Abraham*, come upon the Gentiles, as promised *Gen. 12. 3.*

1. Answer, Is not the Jewish Church State dissolved, and doth not Dr. Owen tell you their Old Covenant is gone? Yet,

2. Do we say, the promise of the New Covenant God made to *Abraham* is dissolved? God forbid, for that is unalterable, and by the Vertue of which it is that believing Gentiles partake of the Blessings of *Abraham*.

But Friend, the Gentiles receive not the Blessings of *Abraham* through the Law, nor through the Covenant of Circumcision, but by Faith in the Promise of the Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham*, viz. in thy Seed shall all the Families of the Earth be Bless'd. Nay *Abraham* himself, 'tis evident, received not that blessedness in the Covenant of circumcision, That Faith was reckoned to *Abraham* for Righteousness, The Apostle asserts *Rom. 4. 9.* How was it then reckoned? When he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. Verse 10. There was no need of this distinction, if circumcision appertained to the Covenant of Grace; we see how 'tis contra-distinguished to the Covenant of Faith:

And he received circumcision, a Seal of the righteousness of the Faith he had, yet being uncircumcised: That he might be the Father of all that Believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed to them also.

From hence I argue that circumcision was a Seal to none but *Abraham*.

1. Because it is said to be a Seal of the righteousness of the Faith, *Abraham* had being yet uncircumcised for so it could not be a Seal to others, because they were circumcised before they believed.

2. Because also it was to assure him of that peculiar Blessing and privilege of being the Father of all that believe. — And none had that prerogative but *Abraham* only.

3. Take this Argument.

If *Abraham* received the Spiritual Blessing, viz. Righteousness and Justification by Faith in the promise of the Covenant of Grace made to him, and received not the Blessing of Righteousness and Justification in the Covenant of circumcision; then there were two Covenants contained in those Covenant, transactions of God with *Abraham*, But the former, and latter is true. Ergo there were two Covenants contained in those Covenant transactions God made with *Abraham*.

In Page 3. Mr. Stute says, the Olive Tree or Covenant God made with *Abraham*, was not dissolved: For the Jews are to be grafted into their own Olive Tree again; but if the Covenant were dissolved and repealed, how can they be taken into it again; for 'tis called their own Olive Tree, *Rom. 11. 11, 12, 17.*

1. Answer This Man mistakes the Holy Ghost: The Apostle speaks not of the Jews, as being *Abrahams* Carnal Seed as such, but of them that belong to the Election of Grace.

2. Now who doubts but that the Covenant of Grace was their Covenant, or Olive Tree, even all of them that shall be taken into it of the Jewish race, in the latter days, as much as it was their Covenant, who were Jews and Elect ones who lived in the Apostles time.

3. It might be called their Olive Tree or Covenant, because the Covenant of Grace as it was made with *Abraham*, ran first to his natural Seed who were the Children of the promise, i. e. the Elect of God; hence Christ said he was not sent, but to the lost Sheep of the House of Israel: That is, not first sent, they were first to have the offer of all New Covenant Grace and Blessings; to them appertained the Covenant and Adoption, &c. viz. in the first place.

4. Do we plead for the dissolution of the Covenant of Grace, God made with or promised to *Abraham*, because we say the Legal and

and external Covenant made with him and his Carnal Seed, as such is removed, by virtue of which they had their political Church State, and visible Church-membership and all other Fleshly and Legal Privileges?

Or do we say, those Jews that believed or their Elect Infants were cast out of the Covenant of Grace? God forbid.

No, for if the Children of unbelieving Jews did believe, it shews they are in covenant also. *In a word.* All that believe, let them be whose Children they will, they are all in the Covenant of Grace: For there is now no difference, Jews and Gentiles, Old and young, bond and free, are all one in Christ Jesus. Now no knowing Men after the Flesh, i. e. upon the account of Fleshly or external Privileges, by descent from Abraham according to the Flesh: *Circumcision nor uncircumcision, availeth nothing; but a new Creature; old things are past away and all things are become new* 2. Cor. 5. 17.

Should this Man object and say, as to Dr. Owen he speaks of the Sinai Covenant, or the Covenant made with the People of Israel, after they came out of Egypt, and not of the Covenant of circumcision.

Answer, I answer that it is evident where Paul excludes the Law as not being of Faith, nor the Covenant of Grace, but opposed unto it, he also excluded upon the same Foot of account circumcision, Rom. 4. 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. Gal. 3. 21. Gal. 5. 3. Rom. 2. 25, 26, 27. Also Mr. Shute says, the Covenant, Deut. 29. 11, 12, 13. is the same God made with Abraham: Take his own words Page 17.

* note this (saith he) by the way, he hath dropped the 13. verse, wherein is the explanation of the Covenant to be the same God made with Abraham and his Seed. Which verse doth indeed clearly shew that the Covenant of circumcision was the same (and but a farther establishment of it) with that given in Horeb, thou shalt enter into Covenant with the Lord thy God, &c. viz. That he may establish thee to day, for a People to himself, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath said unto thee, and hath vowed unto thy Fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

* You ask, What was the personal actual sin which those young Babes committed at the coming in of the Gospel, that provoked God to cast them out of Covenant? for you own that the Seed of believers were once in Covenant, and were Church-members; but if you cannot prove what the transgression was, then all your arguments ought to be committed to the custody of the Effeminate. Keepers thus Mr. Shute.

Answer, You should first prove it was a gracious privilege to Babes or the Carnal Seed of Abraham, that they were in the Legal Covenant and national Church of Israel, before you ask that question.

The Apostle says not, that circumcision was a Privilege, unless they kept the Law, and by it they were obliged to keep it perfectly, and hence it is called a yoke of Bondage.

2. It was not for the Sins of little Babes, that the Legal Covenant and Legal Church was dissolved, at the coming in of the Gospel: But it was the will and pleasure of God to take that Covenant away, that he might establish the second and better Covenant. And God it appears hath done Infants no hurt hereby, since the promise of God made to Abraham, touching Salvation by Christ in the Covenant of Grace stands fast for ever, and is brought in, and established to all the Elect, both of Jews first; and also of the Gentiles. True, the unbelieving Jews were cast off for not believing, for had they believed they had pertaken of like Gospel Grace with those that did believe: But the believing Jews and their Children did no longer abide in that national Church to which they once belonged, nor were their Children until they believed, received into the Gospel Church; yet I affirm that was no Spiritual loss to those Babes, seeing there was no righteousness nor Salvation to be had by the Law, Legal Covenant, nor circumcision.

Mr. Collins will not say that believers and their Seed only were in the Legal Covenant and in the Legal Church, but all unbelievers also, and their Children who sprung from Isaacs Loyns, were in the same Covenant, and were Church-members, and that by Gods appointment too; as far forth as were the godly or believing Jews, and their Children: And Friend, it should appear that among Abrahams Carnal Seed there were but a very small remnant that were believers; Tho' all were in the Legal Covenant then, and were Churchmembers.

3. Say you, You must prove that the Gospel brought less Grace with it, than the Abrogated law carried away.

Answer, The abrogated Law had no Grace in it at all; Grace came not by the Law, but by Jesus Christ; the Law is not of Faith.

4. Here (say you,) you confound and contradict your self; for you say the Church is established

'ed upon better promises, which I do own and have proved in my Book, but the Church State is the same, and therefore that of itself is a sufficient argument to prove that all Children of Christian believers are still in Covenant.

Answer, Must the Carnal Seed be Members of the Gospel-Church as under the Law, or is it else not a better Covenant that God has established? Friend, many other external

Privileges as well as that is gone, the Sons of our Ministers as such, have no right to the Ministry now; yet all the Sons of Ministers as such, had that right under the Law: Besides, we have no Land of Canaan nor glorious eternal Temple, no promise of gathering earthly riches, no Political State of Government among our selves; yet is the Gospel Church State & Gospel Covenant better than that under the Law.

An Account of Mr. Shutes scurrilous language as to the rest of this Sheet: I shall only make some remarks on his hard reproachful and Opprobrious words and abuse of Scripture.

IN Page 2. he compares Mr. Collins with the Jews, as if his Arguments were of like nature with theirs who said, we have a Law, and by our Law be ought to dye.

In Page 5. You do but beat the Air, and Shoot all your Arrows against a Brazen Wall, and there is no more Work for the Club nor Ax.

Answer, He may perceive he was mistaken, for the Ax hath not done with him yet.

He in the said 5. Page abuses that Text, better promises, these are his words, viz. for the promises are better, and that chiefly because circumcision was changed for Baptism.

Answer, Dost the Holy Ghost there refer to this change, or is Baptisma a promise or a precept?

He abuses that Text in *As* 15. 10. the former (saith he meaning circumcision) wherein Infants were chiefly concerned, was such a Yoke as they nor their Fathers were able to bear, they were not able to see their Childrens Flesh cut off, and we have an Instance of this in *Ziporah*, what made her in such a passion with *Moses* her Husband, as that she called him a Bloody Husband twice? Why she tells you her self, it was because of the circumcision.

Answer, In this he seems to charge the Holy God, who appointed and commanded circumcision, as if it was more like a punishment of criminals than an ordinance of God; as he calls *Dipping of Believers in the Name*, &c.

2. Was it from the pain that circumcision put the Infants to, that the Apostle calls it a Yoke, that neither they nor their Fathers could bear? or was it not rather be-

cause it lay them under an obligation to keep the whole Law? for our Apostle, so says in *Gal.* 5. 3. I testify again to every Man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole Law, compared with *Rom.* 2. 25.

3. He abuses that Text *Exod.* 4. 15, 16.

Let him read his Annotations, she called her Husband a bloody Husband or a Spouse of Blood, because she by Blood as it were, redeemed her Husbonds Life. God being provoked against *Moses*, as the 14. verse shews, and she prevented his danger by circumcising her Son.

2. If she referr'd to circumcision it self, as he takes it, yet she being a *Midianitish Woman* that would not Justifie him, thus to reflect on that Holy Rite and Ordinance of God.

In Page 6. says he, so this question may be sent to Essex among the Barren Fjyl Keepers.

Is it safe to Scoff and make a sport when we write about Sacred things? He also reflects upon the whole party of the Baptists; as if we were fallen from our former Principles about humane learning.

'I cannot (says he) but observe how much this People are swerved from their first Principles: For it is not long since they decried humane learning, and also making a trade of preaching, - But if they can get a few Shreds or broken fragments of learning, or a learned Man on their side, they are ready to make an Idol of it, and now they make a Trade of Preaching, Page 16. &c.

Answer, It appears 'tis the whole party he strives to bring into contempt: But let him take heed of belying so gracious a People as the Adversaries themselves confess them to be; did we ever decry humane learning, because

cause we believe and ever did that it is not an essential qualification in a Minister? We are no more for it now than ever we were and we did and do believe that those who preach the Gospel, ought to live of the Gospel.

He renders Mr. Collins no better than a Jesuite; take his words, *'this Man bath confidence and deceit enough to make a swinging Jesuite, &c. Page 16.*

Again, he says, *This deceitful Man hides the Sense and meaning of them from the World; Doth not this savour of great malice? Page 16.*

He says Infants have Faith, yet in Page 10. (of his Book) he asketh *what personal Faith a Child is capable of acting in an ordinary way; or what good Fruits such Children are capable to bring forth?*

1. In Page 8. he renders those false Teachers, who say that the Covenant God made with Abraham is repealed, viz. the Covenant of circumcision; he may see that we deny that the promise or Covenant of Grace God made with Abraham is repealed tho' we say the Covenant of circumcision God made with him is repealed.

2. Such he says are false Teachers who say the Church State under the Law was Carnal.

3. Such as deride and Scoff at habitual Faith in dying Infants; Mr. Collins owns not such Faith to be in Infants is he therefore a false Teacher. But how does he prove he derides or Scoffs, &c.

4. Such who take upon them the Work of the Ministry without Gods Call, or being gifted or qualified he says are false Teachers.

Such we grant are not true Ministers; but doth not he, think you, refer to such who were not trained up in School Learning? I doubt not but our call from God to the Ministry is as good as others have, tho' may be not every ways so well qualified as we ought; yet humane learning is no qualification left by the Holy Spirit in the Scripture.

In Page 7. he says, *In this Authors former Book he hath by excluding Infants from Baptism excluded them from Eternal Life and Salvation; dying in their Infancy. How false that is let all Men Judge who have read Mr. Collins Book, he refers unto Page 41.*

In Page 10. he says, *How wilfully blind and dishonest are you thus falsely to quote my words.* I can see no reason for those Unchristian expressions, in Page 11. he says I suppose he means a long White Shift, as if we Baptized Persons in a White Shift: What sport is here for the Enemies of Religion? *Tho' I deny that*

Women were Baptized in that indecent immodest shameful way and manner; saith he.

He means by Dipping the whole Body: God saith he, *never appointed an ordinance to draw out and gratifie Mens lusts, Page 11.* O see what contempt he doth cast upon that way of Baptizing, which all Christians used for many hundred of years in the Church, and which Christ appointed to the end of the World.

You represent to the World, as if our way of Baptizing were immodest, and done not as comely, or of good Report; for this you are to be accountable to the most high God. Friend, if you please to come and see our Order in the Administration of that Ordinance, I doubt not, but you will be convinced of your Error, and be forc'd to say, That the Subject goeth with more Sobriety and Modesty, to the Sacrament of Baptism, than thousands do to the hearing of Gods Word, or to the Sacrament of the Lords Supper.

In Page 12. *Therefore, saith he, there is no more work for the Club nor the Ax; you may lay them by as useless, or hang them up in Merchants Taylors Hall.* You may know what he intends, and is not this like those who said, *is not this the Carpenter, &c.* see what a strange Prayer he makes in Page 15;

Where he pleads his Innocency, God is a gracious God; and I think the Man is acted in Zeal, but not according to knowledge; in Page 11. he says, *Our Author hath Coined a brand new Epithet, to cover that unseemly Luxurious way of tripping and Dipping Women, &c.*

In Page 18. he would suggest that Mr. Collins is possessed with a Devil: *People say there is a Maid, saith he, possessed in wrapping; for my part I think there is a Man posses'd also; hard words.*

In Page 20. he boasts as if Anabaptism is self hath resigned up the Ghost, and this may serve for its Funeral Sermon. In Page 21. he breaks out, *I cannot tell what to think of this Man (meaning Mr. Collins) That should dare to have so much confidence, as to put out such scurrilous abominable false and scandalous things. Friend, what shall we think of you and your Papers?*

In Page 23. he renders the answering Books that are put out against Infant Baptism, a raking in Dungbills, and therefore such a one as he, he thinks, is fit to do it.

In Page 191. of this last Book he, says that they (meaning the Independant Congregations) are not true Churches, or else we are not: I know no reason for this, for I doubt

not but they are true Churches, as well as we, they being godly Christians, tho' I do believe they may be less compleat Churches: Then those who are baptized upon the profession of Faith, or not so orderly in their constitution: besides they have received (as we Judge a *Tradition of Man* in the stead of *Christ's Institution*.

This man says, he can have Communion with those of our opinion, yet says our Baptism is a counterfeit and we guilty of Sacrilege, Page 190.

But Friend, I see not how they can have Communion with you without repentance, considering all the hard words uttered by you: You know who saith Men must give an account of all their hard Speeches, &c.

God grant those I have mentioned, and these following may not be laid to your charge calling our Baptism a mock Baptism, and us diving *Anticovenanters*, preaching without a call suggesting as if under Diabolical possession, calling *Jesuite*, swinging *Jesuite*; calling Dipping, which was the Apostolical way of Baptizing, more like a punishment of criminals, &c.

Asserting that we make no better of Infants than Dogs, calling our Doctrin *Mountebank*, &c. and a Minister a *C C*, by which 'tis concluded you intend *Coxcomb*, asserting we have *crafty positions*, *uncouth glosses*, that we mince and limit the *fundamental Doctrin* of Mans Salvation,

To conclude, let the Reader take notice of this, viz. Were it not more for the Honour of God and Love to Truth, I had not concerned my self with so little an *Antagonist* as this is.

a π in reproach call some *Arminians*, *Sacianians*, others gone back to *Judaism*, some *gormandisers* feasting on *Legs of Mutton*; in some places reflecting on Mens honest callings God by his providence called them once unto; that our Doctrin damns Infants; &c. whether these Speeches he ought not publicly to acknowledge as evil?

Is not this as bad as to call his Brother *Raca*, i. e. a vain person in anger or malice.

Cant Men write upon controvertible points without such bitterness, and reviling language? I desire Friend, you would go to God in Prayer, and intreat for pardon through Christs Blood, and no longer rest in such a Spirit and practice: Christ is at the Door, take heed of smiting your fellow Servant. But should you instead of answering our arguments proceed still after the same manner, we shall find out another way to deal with you, viz.

Bring our Charge against you for Right and Justice to the Congregation you belong unto: The Lord send, and increase Love and Charity among his People, and unite them together in one Spirit, which he will suddenly do and wipe off our reproach; to whom be glory and praise for ever and ever, Amen.

E R R A T A

IN Page 5. line 7. for *Burke* read *Burkit* p. 8. l. 20. blot out *Blood*, p. 16. l. 37. f. *contained* r. *contrived*, p. 19. l. 28. f. Comma, r. Period. Also in several other Places you will find false Pointing or Stops.

P. 22. blot out the comma in l. 21, 22, 23, 24, 25. they being this Authors words; p. 27. l. 10. add *Gen.* 17. 8, 9. there begins the Covenant of Peculiarity. p. 32. l. 29. f. *purity* r. *parity*, p. 38. l. 3. f. *usurp'd* r. *absurd*, p. 39. l. 18. f. *raiffe* r. *ratified*, p. 41. l. 39. f. *have* r. *have had*, p. 42. l. 3. f. *tho'* r. *the*, p. 29. l. 31. add *as to outward dispensation*, p. 43. l. 1. f. *Natural Church* r. *National*.

F I N I S.

POSTSCRIPT, Containing several Arguments (to disprove Pedo-Baptism, and to prove Believers only the Subjects thereof :) For Mr. Gyles Shute to Answer.

Friend,

If you will not desist but write again, you are desired to answer these Arguments, the stress of the Controversy lying in them.

Arg. 1. If none are to be baptized by the Authority of the great Commission of our Blessed Saviour, *Matth. 28.* but such who are first made Disciples by being taught; than Infants, who are not capable to be taught, ought not to be baptized. But none are to be baptized by the Authority of the great Commission of our Blessed Saviour, but such who are first made Disciples by Teaching. *Ergo*, Little Babes ought not to be baptized.

Arg. 2. If Infant-Baptism was never instituted, commanded, or appointed of God, Infants ought not to be baptized. But Infant-Baptism was never instituted, commanded, or appointed of God. *Ergo*, They ought not to be baptized.

As to the *Major*; If one thing may be practised as an Ordinance without an Institution or Command of God, another thing may also; so any Innovation may be let into the Church.

As to the *Minor*; If there is an Institution for it, 'tis either contained in the great Commission, *Matth. 28.* *Mark 16.* or somewhere else. But 'tis not to be found in the Commission, nor any where else. *Ergo*.

The *Major* none will deny.

The *Minor* I prove thus. None are to be baptized by virtue of the Commission, but such who are discipled by the Word, as I said before, and so the Greek Word μαθηται signifies.

If any should say, Christ commanded his Disciples to baptize all Nations, and Infants are part of Nations, therefore are to be baptized. I answer;

Arg. 3. If all Nations, or any in the Nations ought to be baptized before discipled; then Turks, Pagans, Unbelievers and their Children may be baptized, because they are a great part of the Nations. But Turks, Pa-

gans and Unbelievers, and their Children, ought not to be baptized. *Ergo*.

Besides that, Teaching (by the Authority of the Commission) must go before Baptizing, we have proved; which generally all Learned Men do assert: if the Institution is to be found any where else, they must shew the Place.

Arg. 4. Faith and Repentance are required of all that ought to be baptized. Infants are not required to believe and repent, nor are they capable so to do. *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be baptized.

The *Major* is clear, *Acts 2, 8, 10, 16* Chapters; and 'tis also asserted by the Church of England. What is required of Persons to be baptized? that's the Question. The Answer is, Repentance, whereby they forsake Sin; and Faith, whereby they stedfastly believe the Promise of God made to them in that Sacrament.

The *Minor* cannot be denied.

Arg. 5. That Practice that tends not to the Glory of God, nor to the Profit of the Child, when done, nor in after-times when grown up, but may prove hurtful and of a dangerous Nature to him, cannot be a Truth of God. But the Practice of Infant-Baptism tends not to the Glory of God; nor to the Profit of the Child when baptized, nor in after-times when grown up, but may prove hurtful and of a dangerous Nature to him. *Ergo*. See *Levit. 10. 1, 2.* where *Moses* told *Aaron*, because his Sons had done that which God commanded them not, that God would be sanctified by all that discerned unto him; intimating, that such who did that which God commanded not, did not sanctify or glorify God therein. Can God be glorified by Man's Disobedience, or by adding to his Word; by doing that which God hath not required? *Matth. 16. 9.* Is vain do you worship me, teaching for Doctrine the Commandments of Men: and that that Practice doth

doth profit the Child, none can prove from God's Word: And in after-times when grown up, it may cause the Person to think he was thereby made a Christian, &c. and brought into the Covenant of Grace, and had it sealed to him, nay, thereby regenerated, ~~and that~~ and that Infants are thereby ingrafted also into Christ's Church. Sure all understanding Men know Baptism of Believers is not called Regeneration, but only metonymically, it being a Figure of Regeneration. But they ignorantly affirm also, that Infants then have a federal Holiness; as if this imagined Holiness comes in by the Child's Covenant in Baptism, which may prove hurtful and dangerous to them, and cause them to think Baptism confers Grace, which is a great Error. * How can Water, saith Mr. *Charnock*, an external thing, work upon the Soul physically? Nor can it, saith he, be proved, that ever the Spirit of God is tied by any Promise, to apply himself to the Soul in a gracious Operation, when Water is applied to the Body: If it were so, then all that were baptized were regenerated, then all that were baptized should be saved, or else the Doctrine of Perseverance falls to the Ground. Some indeed, says he, say, that Regeneration is conferred in Baptism upon the Elect, and exerts it self afterwards in Conversion. But how is active a Principle as a spiritual Life should lie dead and asleep so many Years, &c., is not easily conceived. On *Argen.* p. 75.

Arg. 6. If the Church of England says, that Faith and Repentance are required of all that ought to be baptized, and in so saying, speak truly, and yet Infants can't perform those things; then Infants ought not to be baptized. But the Church of England says, that Faith and Repentance are required of all such, &c. and speak truly, and yet Infants cannot perform these things. *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be baptized.

Obiect. If it be objected, That they affirm they do perform it by their Sureties.

Answer. If Suretiship for Children in Baptism is not required of God, and the Sureties do not, cannot perform those things for

the Child: then Suretiship is not of God, and so signifies nothing, but is an unlawful and sinful Undertaking. But Suretiship in Children's Baptism is not required of God, and they do not, cannot perform what they promise. *Ergo*.

Do they, or can they cause the Child to forsake the Devil and all his Works, the Pains and Vanities of this wicked World; and all the sinful Lusts of the Flesh? In a Word; Can they make the Child or Children to repent and truly believe in Jesus Christ? for these are the things they promise for them, and in their Name. Alas, they want Power to do it for themselves, and how then should they do it for others? Besides, we see they never mind nor regard their Covenant in the Case: and will not God one Day say, Who has required these things at your Hands?

Arg. 7. If there be no Precedent in the Scripture, (as there is no Precept) that any Infant was baptized, then Infants ought not to be baptized. But there is no Precedent that any Infant was baptized in the Scripture. *Ergo*.

If there is any Precedent or Example in Scripture that any Infant was baptized, let them shew us where we may find it.

Erasmus saith, 'Tis no where expressed in the Apostolical Writings, that they baptized Children. *Union of the Church*, and on *Row*, 6.

Calvin saith, 'It is no where expressed by the Evangelists, that any one Infant was baptized by the Apostles, *Istis.* c. 16. Book 4.

Ludovicus Vivus saith, 'None of old were wont to be baptized but in grown Age, and who desired and understood what it was. *Vidi Ludov.*

The *Magdiburgensis* say, 'That concerning the baptizing the Adult, both Jews and Gentiles, we have sufficient Proof from *Acts* 2, 8, 10, 16 Chapters; but as to a baptizing of Infants, they can meet with no Example in Scripture. *Magdib. Cur.* l. 2. p. 469.

Dr. Taylor saith, 'It is against the perpetual Analogy of Christ's Doctrine to baptize Infants: For besides that Christ never gave any Precept to baptize them, nor ever him-

'self nor his Apostles (that appears) did baptize any of them: All that either he or his Apostles said concerning it, requires such previous Dispositions of Baptism, of which Infants are not capable, *viz.* Faith and Repentance. *Lib. Proph. 7. 239.*

Arg. 8. If whatsoever which is necessary to Faith and Practice is left in the Holy Scripture, that being a compleat and perfect Rule, and yet Infant-Baptism is not contained or to be found therein, when Infant-Baptism is not of God. But whatever is necessary to Faith and Practice, is contained in the Holy Scriptures, &c. but Infant-Baptism is not to be found therein. *Ergo.*

That the Scripture is a perfect Rule, &c. we have the Consent of all the Ancient Fathers and Modern Divines.

Athanasius saith, 'The Holy Scriptures being Inspirations of God, are sufficient to all Instructions of Truth. *Athas. against the Gentiles.*

Chrysostom saith, 'All things be plain and clear in the Scripture; and whatsoever are needful, are manifest there. *Chrysost. on 2 Thess. and 2 Tim. 2.*

Basil saith, 'That it should be an Argument of Infidelity, and a most certain Sign of Pride, if any Man should reject any thing written, and should introduce things not written. *Basil in his Sermon de Fide.*

Augustine saith, 'In the Scriptures are found all things which concern Faith, manner of Living, Hope, Love, &c. Let us, saith he, seek no farther than what is written of God our Saviour, lest a Man would know more than the Scriptures witness. *Arg. in his 198 Epistles to Fortunat.*

Theophilact saith, 'It is part of a Diabolical Spirit, to think any thing Divine, without the Authority of the Holy Scriptures. *Lib. 2. Paschal.*

Nicholas saith, 'Let us who will have any thing observed of God, search no more but that which the Gospel doth give unto us. *Lib. 5. c. 16. de Eccl.*

Billiamis saith, 'That though the Arguments of the Anabaptists, from the defect of Command or Example, have a great Use against the Lutherans, inasmuch as they

use that Rule every where, having no Command or Example, theirs is to be rejected; yet is it of no Force against Catholics, who conclude the Apostolical Tradition is of no less Authority with us, than the Scripture, &c. this of baptizing of Infants is an Apostolical Tradition. *Billiamis in his Book de Bapt. l. 1. c. 8.*

Mr. Ball saith, 'We must for every Ordinance look to the Institution, and never stretch it wider, nor draw it narrower than the Lord hath made it, for he is the Instructor of the Sacraments according to his own Pleasure; and 'tis our part to learn of him, both to whom, how, and for what End the Sacraments are to be administered. *Ball in his Answer to the New-England Elders, p. 38, 39.*

And as to the *Adm.* is acknowledged by our Adversaries, it is not to be found in the Letter of the Scripture. And as to the Consequences drawn therefrom, we have proved, they are not natural from the Premises; and though we admit of Consequences and Inferences if genuine, yet not in the case of an Institution respecting a practical Ordinance that is of inces possible Right.

Arg. 9. If Infant-Baptism was an Institution of Christ, the Pædo-Baptists could not be at a loss about the Grounds of the Right Infants have no Baptism: But the Pædo-Baptists are at a great Loss, and differ exceedingly about the Grounds of the Right Infants have to Baptism. *Ergo,* 'tis no Institution of Christ.

As touching the *Maj.* I argue thus; That which is an Institution of Christ, the Holy Scripture doth shew, as well the End and Ground of the Ordinance, as the Subject and Manner of it. But the Scripture speaks nothing of the End or Ground of Pædo-Baptism, or for what reason they ought to be baptized. *Ergo,* 'tis no Institution of Christ.

The *Maj.* is undeniable; Some affirm, as we have shewed, p. 15. it was to take away Original Sin. Some say it is their Right by the Covenant, they bring the Seed of Believers. Others say, Infants have Faith, and therefore have a Right. Others say, They have

have a Right by the Faith of their Sareties. Some ground their Right from an Apostolical Tradition; others upon the Authority of Scripture. Some say, All Children of professed Christians ought to be baptized; others say, None but the Children of true Believers have a Right to it. Sure, if it was an Ordinance of Christ, his Word would soon end this Controversy.

Arg. 10. If the Children of believing Gentiles, as such, are not the natural nor spiritual Seed of Abraham, they can have no Right to Baptism, or Church-Membership, by virtue of any Covenant-transaction God made with Abraham. But the Children of believing Gentiles, as such, are not the natural nor spiritual Seed of Abraham. *Ergo.*

Arg. 11. If no Man can prove from Scripture, that any spiritual Benefit redounds to Infants in their Baptism, 'tis no Ordinance of Christ. But no Man can prove from Scripture, that any spiritual Benefit redounds to Infants in their Baptism. *Ergo.*

Arg. 12. That cannot be an Ordinance of Christ, for which there is neither Command nor Example in all God's Word, nor Promise to such who do it, nor Threatnings to such who neglect it. But there is no Command or Example in all the Word of God for the baptizing of little Babes, nor Promise made to such who are baptized, nor Threatnings to such who are not. *Ergo.*

That the Child lies under a Promise who is baptized, or the Child under any Threatning or Danger that is not baptized, let them prove it, since it is denied.

Arg. 13. If no Parents, at any time or times, have been by God the Father, Jesus Christ, or his Apostles, either commended for baptizing of their Children, or reprov'd for neglecting to baptize them; then Infant-Baptism is no Ordinance of God. But no Parents at any time or times have been by God commended for baptizing of their Children, &c. *Ergo.* Infant-Baptism is no Ordinance of God.

This Argument will stand unanswerable, unless any can shew who they were that were ever commended for baptizing their Children, or reprov'd for neglecting it, or unless they can shew a parallel case.

Arg. 14. If Men were not to presume to alter any thing in the Worship of God under the Law, neither to add thereto, nor diminish therefrom, and God is as strict and jealous of his Worship under the Gospel; then nothing ought to be altered in God's Worship under the Gospel. But under the Law Men were not to presume so to do, and God is as strict and jealous under the Gospel. *Ergo.*

The Major cannot be denied.

The Minor is clear; See thou make all things according to the Pattern shew'd thee in the Mount, *Exod. 25. 40.* and *Levit. 10. 1, 2.* See how Nadab and Abihu sped, for presuming to vary from the Command of God, and *Uzzah*, tho' but in small Circumstances as they may seem to us. How dare Men adventure, this being so, to change Baptism from Dipping into Sprinkling, and the Subject, from an Adult Believer, to an ignorant Babe? Add thou yet unto his Word; See.

Arg. 15. Whatever Practice opens a Door to any humane Traditions and Innovations in God's Worship, is a great Evil, and to be avoided: But the Practice of Infant-Baptism opens a Door to any humane Traditions and Innovations in God's Worship. *Ergo.* to sprinkle or baptize Infants is a great Evil, and to be avoided.

The Major will not be denied.

The Minor is clear, because there is no Scripture-ground for it, no Command nor Example for such a Practice in God's Word. And if without Scripture-Authority the Church hath Power to do one thing, she may do another, and so ad infinitum.

Arg. 16. Whatsoever Practice reflects upon the Honour, Wisdom and Care of Jesus Christ, or renders him less faithful than *Moses*, and the New Testament in one of its great Ordinances, (nay, Sacraments) to lie more obscure in God's Word, than any Law or Precept under the Old Testament, cannot be of God. But the Practice of Infant-Baptism reflects on the Honour, Care and Faithfulness of Jesus Christ, and renders him less faithful than *Moses*, and a great Ordinance, (nay, Sacrament) of the New Testament, to lie more dark and obscure than any Precept under the Old Testament. *Ergo.* Infant-Baptism cannot be of God. The

The *Majr* cannot be denied.

The *Majr* is easily proved: For he is bold indeed who shall affirm Infant-Baptism doth not lie obscure in God's Word. One great Parry who asserts it, say, 'tis not to be found in the Scripture at all, but 'tis an unwritten Apostolical Tradition: others say, it lies not in the Letter of the Scripture, but may be proved by Consequences; and yet some great Asserters of it, as Dr. Hammond and others, say, Those Consequences commonly drawn from divers Texts for it, are without Demonstration, and so prove nothing. I am sure a Man may read the Scripture a hundred times over, and never be thereby convinced; he ought to baptize his Children, tho' it is powerful to convince Men of all other Duties.

Now can this be a Truth, since Christ who was more faithful than *Moses*, and delivered every thing plainly from the Father? *Moses* left nothing dark as to matter of Duty, tho' the Precepts and external Rites of his Law were numerous, two or three hundred Precepts, yet none were at a loss, or had need to say, Is this a Truth or an Ordinance, or not? for he that runs may read it.

And shall one positive Precept given forth by Christ, who appointed so few in the New Testament, be so obscure, as also the ground and end of it, that Men should be confounded about the Proofs of it, together with the end and ground thereof? See *Act. 3. 3. 6.*

Arg. 17. That Custom or Law which *Moses* never delivered to the Jews, nor is any where written in the Old Testament, was no Truth of God, nor of Divine Authority. But that Custom or Law to baptize Profelytes either Men, Women or Children, was never given to the Jews by *Moses*, nor is it any where written in the Old Testament. *Ergo*, It was no Truth of God, nor of Divine Authority: And evident it is, as Sir *Isaac Newton* shews, That the *Jewish Rabbis* differed among themselves also about it: for, saith he, *Rabbi Eliezer* expressly contradicts *Rabbi Joshua*, who was the first I know of who asserted this sort of Baptism among the Jews: For *Eliezer*, who was contemporary with *Rabbi Joshua*, if he did not live before him, asserts, that a

Profelyte circumcised and not baptized, was a true Profelyte.

Arg. 18. If Baptism is of mere positive Right, wholly depending on the Will and Sovereign Pleasure of Jesus Christ, the great Legislator: And he hath not required or commanded Infants to be baptized: then Infants ought not to be baptized: But Baptism is of mere positive Right, wholly depending on the Will and sovereign Pleasure of Jesus Christ, the great Legislator, and he hath not required or commanded Infants to be baptized. *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be baptized.

This Argument tends to cut off all the pretended Proofs of Pædo-Baptism, taken from the Covenant made with *Abraham*; and because Children are said to belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, it was not the Right of *Abraham's* Male Children to be circumcised, because they were begotten, and born of the Fruit of his Loins, till he received Commandment from God to circumcise them. Had he done it before, or without a Command from God, it would have been Will-Worship in him so to have done. Moreover, this further appears to be so, Because no godly Man's Children, nor others in *Abraham's* Days, nor since, had any Right thereto, but only his Children, (or such who were bought with his Money, or were profelyted to the Jewish Religion) because they had no Command from God so to do, as *Abraham* had. This being true, it follows, that if we should grant Infants of believing Gentiles, as such, were the Seed of *Abraham* (which we deny) yet unless God had commanded them to baptize their Children, they ought not to do it; and if they do it without a Command or Authority from Christ, it will be found an Act of Will-Worship in them.

Arg. 19. All that were baptized in the Apostolical Primitive Times, were baptized upon the Profession of Faith, were baptized into Christ, and thereby put on Christ, and were all one in Christ: Jesus, and were *Abraham's* Seed and Heirs, according to Promise. But Infants, as such, who are baptized, were not baptized upon the Profession of their Faith, nor did they put on Christ thereby,

nor

nor are they all one in Christ Jesus, also are not Abraham's Seed and Heirs according to Promise. Ergo, Infants ought not to be baptized.

Mr. Baxter confirms the Substance of the Major. These are his very Words, i. e. As many as have been baptized have put on Christ, and are all one in Christ Jesus; and Mr. Abraham's Seed, and Heirs, according to the Promise, Gal. 3. 27, 28, 29. This speaks the Apostle, such he, of the Probability grounded on a credible Profession, &c. Baxter's Confession Re-
spond. pag. 32.

The Minor will stand firm till any can prove Infants by a visible Profession have put on Christ, are all one in Christ Jesus, are Abraham's Seed and Heirs according to Promise. Evident it is, none are the spiritual Seed of Abraham, but such who have the Faith of Abraham, and are truly grafted into Christ, by a Saving-Faith. If any object, We read of some who were baptized, who had no Saving-Faith, but were Hypocrites. I answer; Had they appeared to be such, they had not been baptized, nor had they a true Right thereto.

Arg. 20. Baptism is the solemnizing of the Souls Marriage-Union with Christ, which Marriage-Contract absolutely requires an actual Profession of consent. Infants are not capable to enter into a Marriage-Union with Christ, nor to make a Profession of Consent. Ergo, Infants ought not to be baptized.

The Major our Opposites generally grant, particularly see what Mr. Baxter saith, 'Our Baptism is the solemnizing of our Marriage with Christ. These are his Words, p. 32.

The Minor need not deny: No Man sure in his right Mind, will assert that little Babes are capable to enter into a Marriage-Union with Christ, and to make a Profession of a Consent: And the Truth is, he in the next Words gives away his Cause, viz. And this, saith he, a new and strange kind of Marriage, where there is no Profession of Consent; p. 32. How unhappy was this Man to plead for such a new and strange kind of Marriage: Did he find any little Babe he ever baptized (or rather rinzed) to make a Profession of Consent to be married to Jesus

Christ. If any should object, he speaks of the Baptism of the Adult. I answer, his Words are these, 'Our Baptism is, &c. Besides, Will any Pede-Baptist say, that the Baptism of the Adult is the solemnizing of the Souls Marriage with Christ, and not the Baptism of Infants. Reader, observe how our Opposites are forced sometimes to speak the Truth, though it overthrows their own Practice of Pede-Baptism.

Arg. 21. If the Sins of no Person are forgiven them till they are converted, then they must not be baptized for the Forgiveness of them, till they profess themselves to be converted; but the Sins of no Persons are forgiven them till they are converted. Ergo, No Person ought to be baptized for the Forgiveness of them, till they profess they are converted.

Mr. Baxter in the said Treatise lays down the Substance of this Argument also, take his own Words, i. e. 'As their Sins are not forgiven them till they are converted, Mark 4. 12. so they must not be baptized for the Forgiveness of them, till they profess themselves converted, seeing to the Church, as *essy*, and *anagorizari* is all one. Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus is the Sum of that Preaching that makes Disciples, Acts 20. 21. Therefore, saith he, both these must by a Profession seem to be received, before any at Age are baptized; p. 30. 31. And evident it is, say I, from hence none but such at Age ought to be baptized. Philip caused the Eunuch to profess before he would baptize him, that he believed that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. Saul had also, saith he, more than a bare Profession before Baptism, Acts 9. 5, 22, 17. p. 28. The Promise it self, saith he, doth expressly require a Faith of our own, of all the Adult that will have part in the Privileges; therefore there is a Faith of our own, that is the Condition of our Title; Mark 16. 16. p. 16.

He might have added by the Force of his Argument; therefore Infants should not have the Privileges: for I argue thus, viz.

Arg. 22. If there is but one Baptism of Water left by Jesus Christ in the New Testament,

ment; and but one Condition or Manner of Right thereto: and that one Baptism is that of the Adult; then Infant-Baptism is no Baptism of Christ. But there is but one Baptism in Water left by Christ in the New Testament, and but one Condition and Manner of Right thereto, and that one Baptism is that of the Adult. *Ergo*, Infant-Baptism is no Baptism of Christ.

Mr. Baxter saith, Faith and Repentance is the Condition of the Adult, and as to any other Condition, I am sure the Scripture is silent; the Way of the Lord is one, *our Lord, our Faith, our Baptism*, Ephes. 4. 4.

If Profession of Faith were not necessary, saith Mr. Baxter, *our Ecclesiastical*, to Church-Membership and Privileges, then Infidels and Heathens would have Right; also, saith he, the Church and the World would be confounded. He might have added, but Infidels and Heathens have no Right to Church-Membership, &c. *Ergo*, 'Tis a grounded Case among all Christians, saith he, that Profession is thus necessary, the Apostles and Ancient Church admitted none without it; pag. 27. And if so, why dare any now adays admit of Infidels, who are capable to make no Profession. He adds, 'Yea Christ in his Commission directeth his Apostles to make Disciples, and then baptize them, promising, *that whosoever shall be baptized, shall be saved*, Mark 16. 16. pag. 27. Furthermore he saith, 'If as many as are baptized into Christ, are baptized into his Death, and are buried with him by Baptism into Death; that like as Christ was raised from the Dead, so we also should walk in Newness of Life, &c. Then no doubt, saith he, but such as were to be baptized, did first profess this Mortification, and a Consent to be buried, &c. In our Baptism we put off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh, by the Circumcision of Christ, being buried with him, and raised with him through Faith, quickened with him, and having all our Iniquities forgiven, Col. 2. 12, 13. And will any Man (say he) yea, will Paul ascribe all this to those that did not so much as profess the things signified? Will Baptism, in the Judgment of a wise Man, do all this for an Infidel, (or, say I, for an Infant) that cannot make a Profession that he is a Christian? pag. 31, 32. He proceeds—

Arg. 23. The Baptized are in Scripture called Men washed, sanctified, justified; they are called Saints, and Churches of Saints, 1 Cor. 1. 2. all Christians are sanctified ones, pag. 33. Now let me add the *Minor*.

But Infants baptized are not in Scripture called Men washed, sanctified, justified, they are not called Saints, Churches of Saints, Christians, nor sanctified ones. *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be baptized. If any should say, Why did you not cite these Assertions of Mr. Baxter's whilst he was living? I answer, More than twelve Years ago I did receive and print these Assertions, and many other Arguments of his to the same Purpose, to which he gave no Answer.

Arg. 24. If there is but one way for all, both Parents and Children to be admitted into the Gospel-Church to the End of the World, and that it is upon the Profession of Faith to be baptized; then both Parents and Children must upon the Profession of their Faith be baptized, and so admitted, &c. But there is but one way for all, both Parents and Children, to be admitted into the Gospel-Church to the End of the World, and that is upon the Profession of their Faith to be baptized. *Ergo*.

Arg. 25. That cannot be Christ's true Baptism wherein there is not, cannot be a lively Representation of the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, together with our Death unto Sin, and Vivification to a new Life. But in the Ranzing or Sprinkling of an Infant, there is not, cannot be a lively Representation of Christ's Death, Burial and Resurrection, &c. *Ergo*.

Arg. 26. Thus pretended Baptism, that tends to frustrate the glorious End and Design of Christ in his instituting of Gospel-Baptism, or cannot answer it, is none of Christ's Baptism. But the pretended Baptism of Infants tends to frustrate the glorious end and design of Christ in instituting of Gospel-Baptism. *Ergo*.

The *Major* will now be denied.

As to the *Minor*, all generally confess the End or Design of Christ in instituting the Ordinance of Baptism, was in a lively Figure, to represent his Death, Burial, and Resurrection, with the Person's Death unto Sin,

Sin, and his rising again to walk in newness of Life, that is baptized, as the Sacrament of the Supper was ordained to represent his Body was broke, and his Blood was shed. But that a lively Figure of Christ's Death, Burial, and Resurrection, appears in sprinkling a little Water on the Face, I see not; and as done to an Infant, there can no Death to Sin, and rising again to walk in newness of Life, be signified; And therefore Christ's Design and End therein is frustrated.

Arg. 27. If Baptism be Immersion, as to the proper and genuine signification of the word *Baptizo*, as also of those Typical and Metaphorical Baptisms and the spiritual Signification thereof; then Sprinkling cannot be Christ's true Baptism. But Immersion is the proper and genuine signification of the word *Baptizo*, and also of those Typical and Metaphorical Baptisms spoken of, and the spiritual Signification thereof. Ergo, Sprinkling is not Christ's true Baptism.

1. That the proper and genuine Signification of the word *Baptizo* is Immersion, or to dip, &c. we have proved, which is also confessed by the Learned in that Language.

2. The Figurative Baptism was, 1st. That of the Red Sea, wherein the Fathers were buried, as it were, unto Moses in the Sea, and under the Cloud. *Pools Annotations on 1 Cor. 10. 2.* 'Others, saith he, more probably think that the Apostle useth this term, in regard of the great Analogy betwixt Baptism (as it was then used) the Persons going down into the Waters, and being dipped in them; and the Israelites going down into the Sea, the great Receptacle of Water, though the Water at that time was gathered on Heaps on either side of them; yet they seemed buried in the Water, as Persons in that Age were when they were baptized, &c. The 2^d. was that of Noah's Ark. See Sir Norton Knatchbull: 'The Ark of Noah and Baptism, saith he, were both a Type and Figure of the Resurrection, not the Sign of the washing away of Sin, though so taken metonymically, but a particular Sign of the Resurrection of Christ: of this Baptism is a lively and emphatical Figure, as also was the Ark of Noah, out of which he

* returned as from a Sepulchre, to a new Life.

3. Metaphorical Baptism is that of the Spirit and of Affliction: the first signifies not a sprinkling of the Spirit, but the great Effusion of the Spirit, like that at Pentecost, Acts 1. 4. 5. *Shall be baptized, &c.* on which Words Casaubon speaks thus: See Dr. Davil on Acts 2. 'The Greek Word βαπτίζω is to dip or plunge, as it were to die Colours, in which Sense, saith he, the Apostles might be truly said to have been baptized: for the House in which this was done, was filled with the Holy Ghost; so that the Apostles might seem to have been plunged in to it as in a large Fish-Pond. Also Occuminius on Acts 2. saith, 'A Wind filled the whole House, that it seemed like a Fish-Pond, because it was promised to the Apostles, that they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost. And the Baptism of Affliction are those great depths or overwhelming of Afflictions, like that of our Saviour's suffering, i. e. no part free; Matth. 20. 22. where you have the same Greek Word βαπτίζω; and like that of David, who saith, God drew him out of great Waters.

4. The spiritual Signification thereof is the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ, and of our Death to Sin, and Vivification to a new Life.

This being so, it follows undeniably Sprinkling cannot be Christ's true Baptism, it must be Immersion, and nothing else.

And in the last Place, Finally, To confirm that *Baptizo* is to dip, both from the literal and spiritual Signification thereof, as also from those typical and metaphorical Baptisms mentioned in the Scripture, I might add further, that this evidently appears from the Practice of John Baptist and the Apostles of Christ, who baptized in Rivers, and where there was much Water: and also, because the Baptizer and Baptized are said to go down into the Water, (not down to the Water) and came up out of the Water. John Baptist is said to baptize them into Jordan, as the Greek Word renders it, which shews it dipping and not sprinkling. Would it be proper to say, He sprinkled them into Jordan? The Lord open the Eyes of those who see not, to consider these things.